DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 440 HE 010 268

AUTHOR Burnford, Fran; Chenault, Joann
TITLE The Current State of Human Services Professional Education. Human Services Monograph Series, Number 7, May 1978.
INSTITUTION Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. Project Share.
PUB DATE May 78
NOTE 119p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies; Conference Reports; Directories; Federal Legislation; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Human Services; Literature Reviews; *National Surveys; *Professional Education; Program Administration; Program Development; Questionnaires; *Social Services

ABSTRACT

Information about the current status of graduate human services programs in institutions of higher education in the U.S. is provided. This monograph is divided into four parts. Part I presents background information that has appeared in the professional literature. Part II summarizes the deliberations of the task teams participating at a conference dealing with human services held at the University of California in February, 1977. A description of and results from a national survey of human services graduate programs at George Peabody College for Teachers, University of California at Davis, State University of New York at Brockport, George Washington University, The Collge for Human Services (New York), Cornell University, University of Maine at Portland-Gorham, and Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. Also described are human service centers at Case Western Reserve University, University of Maine at Portland-Gorham, University of California at San Jose, University of Southern California, and Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. The appendices contain the questionnarie used in the national survey of human services education and a list of respondents to the questionnarie, and the roster of participants at the University of California conference. A bibliography of over 60 references is included. (SPG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

Human Services

NUMBER 7 MAY 1978 MONOGRAPH SERIES

ED157440

The Current State of Human Services Professional Education

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROJECT SHARE

A National Clearinghouse
for Improving the Management
of Human Services

HE 010 268

Human Services

NUMBER 7 MAY 1978 MONOGRAPH SERIES

The Current State of Human Services Professional Education

FRAN BURNFORD
COLLEGE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

JOANN CHENAULT
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

PROJECT SHARE

A National Clearinghouse
for Improving the Management
of Human Services

DISCLAIMER

PROJECT SHARE has contracted to prepare this monograph series in order to survey the state of the knowledge or the state of the literature in selected subject areas of importance to the human services community. The monograph series will also provide an opportunity for authors to offer their views and opinions on these topics. It is the aim of PROJECT SHARE to stimulate discussion through the publication of these monographs.

The views and opinions expressed in this monograph are entirely those of the authors and are not necessarily those of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; PROJECT SHARE; or Aspen Systems Corporation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Purpose 1
Historical Background 1

PART I

Background in the Professional Literature 3

Integrated Human Services Education 12
The Organizational Context for Human Services Program 16

PART II

The California Conference Report 23

Present Status and Future National Needs for Human Services Education 26
Relationships Between Human Services Education and Human Services Practice 26
Program Development Issues of Human Services Training in Higher Education 27
Program Administration Problems in Human Services Education 27
Program Evaluation 28
National Task Team Recommendations 28
Definitions 30
Relationships Between Federal Legislation and Human Services Education 31
Relationships Between Higher Education and Human Services Delivery 33
Economic and Political Considerations 34
Program Development Issues of Human Services Training in Higher Education 35
Options for Program Development 35

Human Services Concepts/Program Development 37
Preparation for Professional Roles 37
Program Administration Problems in Human Services Education 40

PART III

Human Services Education Report 45

The National Survey of Human Services Education 45
Description of the Process 46
Analysis of Information 46
The Nature of Education Programs in Human Services 47
The Term Human Services, and Related Terms 48
Human Services Education Questionnaire Responses 49

PART IV

Illustrative Human Services Graduate Programs 67

George Peabody College for Teachers 67
University of California at Davis 68
State University College at Brockport (New York) 69
The George Washington University 69
The College for Human Services 71
Cornell University 72
University of Maine at Portland-Gorham 73
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville 74

Human Services Centers 75

Case Western Reserve University 76
University of Maine at Portland-Gorham 76
University of California at San Jose 77
University of Southern California 78
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville 78

BIBLIOGRAPHY 80

APPENDICES 85

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

This document will attempt to provide information about the current status of graduate human services education programs in institutions of higher education in the United States.

As a general starting place, we have used a definition of graduate human services education from the professional literature (Chenault and Mermis, 1976):

> Those programs that contribute to the education of human services personnel through learning experiences and subject content that are integrated *across* community systems.

As our examination of the present state of graduate human services programs proceeded, it became apparent that few programs calling themselves human services fit this definition in its fullest implications. Whether this definition is a goal toward which existing programs will move or whether a new definition(s) will emerge over time remains to be seen.

At this stage in the evolution of human services directions, the term naturally means different things in different education programs; and it is precisely the nature of these differences we have attempted to discuss and convey.

It is our hope that this report will assist administrators and faculty to view their institution's various human services programs from a national perspective. There should be a number of ways in which the information contained in this monograph could be used to further the purposes of any single institution's human services program directions. The report should also be a valuable resource for government, the private sector, and community professionals in human services across the country.

Historical Background

There is ample evidence in the professional literature of a common mixture of influences and directions that could be called the human services movement (Dumont, 1970; Schulberg, 1972; Curtis, 1973; Schulberg, Baker, and Roen,1973; Weisman, 1973; Baker, 1974; Brown and

Isbister, 1974; Demone, 1974; Demone and Harshbarger, 1974; Hasenfeld and English, 1974; Levenson, 1974; Morales and Mikulecky, 1974; Chenault, 1975).

The broader human services professional literature from various fields provides additional evidence of this evolving human services movement. However, until recently this literature has remained generally within professional categorical boundaries. The professional literatures of mental health, community psychiatry, community psychology, social work, public administration, and other fields have not, to any significant degree, incorporated the human services literatures of the other professional fields.

The only existing comprehensive integration of human services professional literature *across fields* is the work of Mermis (1977). The importance of bringing these isolated human services "literatures" together in their systemic relationships is so great, the future development of human services education may depend largely upon the degree to which human services educators follow this lead.

An examination of this literature across fields highlights both the paucity of attention that has been given to human services education and the need for change in this area. Broskowski (1971), Broskowski and Yessian (1977), Lawrence (1974), Schulberg et. al. (1974), and others have suggested the need for new training models for human services professionals. In the past several years, professional educators in colleges and universities throughout the nation have both written about and attempted to develop education programs for human services personnel. These programs are designed to provide students with the knowledge, skills, and experience that will help them to be more responsive, responsible, humanistic, and competent as they enter the area of community services.

We have been in contact with a number of these professionals who have implemented programs with titles containing the words, human services; but there seemed, in most cases, to be little else in common among the programs. For this reason we have felt a need to obtain more specific information from as many institutions of higher education as we could. Only institutions, who, by their own definition, have implemented studies at the *graduate* level of human services were examined.

The Human Services Center at the University of Southern California has made systematic attempts to focus national awareness on the need for developing appropriate human services education models. Some of these efforts included: a) the 1977 Human Services Education Report (Chenault & Burnford), a national survey of human services graduate education programs; and b) an HEW-sponsored national conference, in February 1977, which brought together 50 academician's practioners, and selected government officials from throughout the country, to study issues in human services and higher education. The contents of this monograph are drawn primarily from the findings of these two efforts.

PART I: BACKGROUND IN THE PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE

It has not been our intention to study professional education relating to individual professional fields or to compare and contrast them. Because our purpose has focused upon the emerging "human services field", we have excluded comments and references to many studies and discussions dealing with professional education as it relates to specific professional disciplines or fields.

Instead we have carefully selected only those writings that will enable the reader to gain a general overview which can act as a frame of reference for the information found in this particular study. There will be references to a few studies dealing with individual professional fields, but most references will relate to the new vision of human services as a field, or a "kind" of field, in itself.

Some of the literature which has special relevance to this study will be summarized at the beginning of our report; other references will be made later at particular points in the discussion where they will be more useful to the reader.

As early as 1970, Dumont described what he called "the new face of professionalism", based upon some common concepts:

1. *Consumer control*

   Programs of education, health, law enforcement, housing, highway design, anything that affects the lives of residents of a community will now, and for a long time to come, be met with demands for citizen participation...But superficial or token adherence will not work...because the consumers themselves have learned how to work the system and will no longer be tricked by false promises.

2. *Challenging credentialism*

   Empty pedants and profound scholars become part of the same beloved community through the baptism of doctorates in philosophy administered by other pedants and

scholars...Some physicians insist that their medical degree brings to them not merely advanced skills and knowledge, but a kind of divine right to preempt and monopolize all kinds of technologies, from measuring the thickness of eye glasses to plumbing the depths of a troubled soul.

3. *Common purpose and common language*

In each discipline, professionals find the ultimate and most salient purpose of their separate professions to be the same—the well-being of people. Students, teachers, and practitioners from various fields are seeking out one another . . . to develop egalitarian, mutually supportive relationships . . . They are enriching one another with reciprocal wisdom and breaking down the institutional and disciplinary walls that arbitrarily divided them . . . With professionals insisting on the end product of their activities being subject to their approbation, politicians, industrialists and chiefs of staff will no longer be able to determine the nation's denstiny.

4. *A new critical spirit*

An attitude of criticism . . . and demands of students are outstripping the preparedness of their teachers to depart from the apprentice model of training . . . The students of the various disciplines are searching, questioning and skeptical. They want to know what the evidence is and what the alternatives are.

5. *Impatience with the rate of change*

The New Professionals adhere, in Weber's terms, more to an "ethic of responsibility" than to an "ethic of ultimate ends". They are aware that social change is no longer a matter of progress but is now a matter of survival. ...Architects know that the design of public buildings has more often resulted from issues of political favoritism than from function or aesthetics. City planners know that zoning decisions are more often made on the basis of vested interests than of the rational and humane planning of cities. Mental health professionals are learning that the nature of an urban renewal program or the location of an industrial plant has greater impact on the mental health of a population than what they themselves can provide for a generation.

6. *A different kind of special interest*

The New Professionals are not afraid of power or its manipulation because while they may make mistakes and serious ones, they are at least participating in the redistribution of power and the pluralization of decision making...What appears to drive them is not the personal dread of poverty, or the insatiable appetite for wealth, or the fascination with esoteric skills and complicated machinery, or the yearning for status and command of others that counted among the reasons for their teachers having developed professional careers for themselves. The new animus of professionalism is compassion.

Closely related to the *new professional* described by Dumont are the *qualities for the community psychologist* (Kelly, 1971). While Dumont was describing what he considered to be an existing situation, Kelly's description is of a professional toward which we should strive. The

ecological perspective which the author proposes means "shifting the focus in our communities away from our personal aspirations, our sponsoring insitutions, and even the visible persons or institutions in town, and instead, making the local conditions and the local events the forum for our work...Viewing a community ecologically means seeing how persons, roles, and organizations, as well as events, are interrelated."

Kelly suggests that the reluctance of professionals to work on generic problems as defined by citizens is one of the biggest impediments in the provision of human services. The seven qualities proposed imply different, if not radical, approaches to training:

1. *Clearly identified competence*

   The community psychologist must do at least one thing clearly and well . . . Training for community work requires more than an endless number of self-development sessions . . . The competence should be taught to members of the host community so that the community psychologist must learn how to translate and vary his competencies from place to place . . . It is not enough to be competent; he must express and communicate so that his competencies are adopted by local resources.

2. *Creating an eco-identity*

   The professional's definition of himself is determined by his direct engagement with the community...Building an eco identity does not mean spilling positive regard for every niche and corner of the environment. It refers more to caring enough about the community so that all of the various sectors are explored, observed, and digested . . . it certainly takes a lot of personal toughness to make it through a community, to sense the range of behavior, styles, and conflicts, without becoming immune to the diversity and seeing only the chaos...Coping with the ambiguities of the enviroment requires that the worker be sustained and carried by his commitment to understand the locale.

3. *Tolerance for diversity*

   The quality of appreciating differences between persons and groups refers to an active searching out of what these differences mean . . . Diverse resources that are contained have some chance of contributing to the development of the community, but as in all organic systems, resources must be managed.

   . . . Tolerance of diversity is not expressed passively as a spongy attitude; tolerance for diversity is the quality of putting the resources to work to help secure options for the long-term cultivation of a locale. Diversity represents an active effort to mobilize the community to plan for its future.

4. *Coping effectively with varied resources*

   This quality is closest to what might be termed empathy, for it means that the community psychologist can take the role of others and move beyond the expressive roles and postures persons often display . . . It speaks directly to the interpersonal effectiveness required of the community psychologist.

> . . . It means that he can recover from social slights, brush-offs, stalls, confrontations, flatteries, and payoffs, and keep going on to the location of talent . . . Identifing the talents and skills that are needed for a community is the gusty work of community development . . . Performing this role involves an important and rare activity, namely, linking available resources to the solution of a community problem.

5. *Commitment to risk taking*

> Risk taking does not refer to impulsive acts or expressing whims . . . but to being an advocate for a real cause and helping the community move beyond its present steady state. It means participating with citizens in social programs that may fail . . . it means going to bat for a marginal person . . . taking a personal position on a controversial issue . . . The history of effective and successful community development is related to the viability of indigenous movements launching risky activities.

6. *Metabolic balance of patience and zeal*

> Being really helpful involves a cycling of patience for achieving long-term goals with a zeal for pursuing short-term objectives . . . Learning how to balance these energies means that the worker must create a perspective to help himself see how to get from one part of his objective to the other . . . to have a clear conception of the various constraints affecting a particular activity . . . Knowing when to mobilize and when to lay back is an art in community work.
>
> By assessing the complexity of factors that impede the development of the community, there is an opportunity to define priorities more clearly and to organize energies.

7. *Giving away the by-line*

> Too often professionals have a frail vanity about making sure that they get the credit for what they do . . . a new set of criteria for scientific work is needed, criteria for the assessment of natural environments that lead to useful and real help for community resources . . . (the professional) focusing on the consequences of his work rather than the work itself . . . as if the by-line for his work is a community story.

While the particular professional described above is a community psychologist, other kinds of professionals will notice immediately that these qualities refer as well to many, if not all, human service professionals. In fact, this example illustrates what we have called the role-centered or profession-centered thinking of human services professionals. Individuals in each forward-thinking professional group are striving to broaden the group's scope and knowledge to fit the contemporary human services movement.

When one begins to examine the evolving definitions of professional roles across fields, it becomes clear the overlapping of roles in the broader arena seems not to be apparent to the individual professions. Were one to put together the contemporary definitions of public administrator, social worker, mental health professional, community psychologist, community planner, and many others, it would not be easy to identify which were which without the titles to remind us.

PART I: BACKGROUND IN THE PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE

Khajavi and Broskowski (1973) evaluated the impact of training on alumni of the Harvard Laboratory of Community Psychiatry, a postdoctoral program for psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, nurses, sociologists, educators, anthropologists and others. Their data indicated that the professional activities and work settings of the respondents became more diversified after the completion of the training program.

The authors suggest that the interdisciplinary aspects of such training must be maintained and that community-oriented specialists will serve vital roles as leaders in planning new programs and services. They will also serve as psychiatry's link to other human service-specialists in related disciplines. If psychiatry is to maintain a leadership role in the organization and delivery of mental health services, we must train specialists who can function effectively in the highly diversified communities of the future."

An example of the continuing expansion of professional roles across fields is provided in a special issue of *Social Work* where Briar (1974) makes the following observations:

> What role will social workers play in the future development of human services. In part the answer depends on the extent to which social work is willing to expand its conception of "direct" social work services to incorporate more of what is subsumed in human services, and then to support a broadened definition with training, practice, research, and professional recognition.

Briar reflects one of the rare examples of awareness of service and training developments in other fields than his own: "Meanwhile, separate training programs for a human services profession outside social work are springing up so that the time for social work to make a strong move in this area may be running short, if it is deemed desirable that we play a central role."

In speaking to the future place of social work in the human services, Morris (1974) defines the term, human services, as covering "several subsystems of the social welfare system that employ social workers in either a dominant or peripheral position." He goes on to say these subsystems include health and medical care, law and justice, education, income security, and the reinforcement of personal growth and family cohesiveness (family services, and the like).

It is amusing to imagine how professionals in these fields would react to their assigned status as *subsystems* of the social welfare system!

According to Morris, the major shift in social work training and standards is the recognition of the bachelor's degree in social work (BSW). He further predicts:

> ... the opportunities for experimentation in state and local governments will grow because of pressure to produce better results in service ... there will be stronger and more widespread objections to increases in taxes and government spending. These two factors should increase the influence of major specialized agencies in shaping the staffs they will employ for both specialized and specific positions.
>
> The outcome of this war between the efforts of educators to generalize and the tendency of employers to specialize is not easy to predict, but it is likely that there will be an increase in short-term post-BSW training by schools and employers alike, while the MSW programs will experiment with the development of advanced forms of specialized skills.

> . . . It can be expected that the next ten years will see a competition among professional organizations comparable to that which took place in the late 1930's and early 1940's among such associations as the American Association of Social Workers, the American Association of Medical Social Workers, and the American Association of Psychiatric Social Workers on one hand and the various unions representing the economic interests of employees in public and private agencies on the other hand.
>
> The strength of the profession will continue to be its readiness to go into the homes of the persons it serves . . . However, in the future the profession will be stronger in its readiness to combine assessment and counseling with management of other more tangible services . . . BSW programs will supplement their courses in the concepts of human development with training in techniques of providing a variety of tangible services, such as home health, home maker, home help, day care, institutional, or residential care. On the MSW and PH.D. levels there will be increased attention to the management side of administering such services and to complexities of team leadership, especially when such leadership includes administrative responsibilities . . . .

Social work is not the only professional field that speaks bluntly about the survival of the profession. Profession-centered thinking is not a characteristic to be scorned when one considers not only the historical development of the professions, but also the personal and career development of the professionals in them.

Yet it is this same profession-centered thinking (professional identity) that can set up competive rather than collaborative among forces professions and among professionals in the evolution of the human services movement.

The field of public administration is no exception to the general interest of the various professional education programs in *human services* education. Agranoff (1974) suggests that human services is a new field or a new approach which "relies heavily on (but in no way duplicates) other fields or services." According to the author, a holistic human services training approach would include in its curriculum such areas as:

1. Politics, power structures, and publics in human service policy processes and networks;

2. The methods, procedures, and processes of planning and policy making in human service systems, including regional planning for individual services and integration of services;

3. Management of the human service enterprise, including examination of the changing role of individualized services in integrated human service programs and strategies and methods of organizational change which accompany new modes of delivery;

4. Interagency relationships in multiservice delivery programs and in networks of independent agencies; and

5. Models of delivery in human services programming and alternative delivery systems for the human services.

PART I: BACKGROUND IN THE PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE

According to Agranoff, the greatest single pitfall in establishing human services administration training programs is . . . "to assume that human services administration is merely a little bit of this and a little bit of that and follow this approach academically. A superficial view might be that the administrator is part social worker, part lobbyist, part YMCA leader, part public health worker, part psychologist, part nurse, part policeman, etc. The easy way out is to throw together a program which parades administrative trainees through courses in abnormal psychology, public health, group work, counseling, principles of welfare, etc."

In discussing education for public administrators, Slavin and Olson (1972) warn that acceptable entry-level professionals will only be produced through highly innovative multidisciplinary academic programs. They report there are not many examples of truly innovative multidisciplinary programs because such approaches seem to "make university administrators nervous."

It has been suggested by Beyle and Gove (1972) that some of the problems associated with universities' unresponsiveness to social issues and programs that deal with public service might be resolved if public service could become an equal partner to teaching and research in the reward system of the organization. They are speaking of the granting of financial, status, and tenure rewards. They ask why those participating in public service do not receive reduced teaching loads on an equal basis with those who do research.

The most recent survey before the one reported in this monograph appears to be a questionnaire (Buntz, 1977) sent to members of the Section on Human Resource Administration of the American Society of Public Administration (123 of whom replied with usable returns). The purpose of the questionnaire was to solicit the opinions of human service professionals about the appropriate education for human service administrators.

Two biases were reflected in the findings:

1. The management of human service programs requires an interdisciplinary type of preparation; and

2. Human service programs must be managed by persons trained in administration if services to clients are to be effectively, efficiently, and equitably provided.

Ten areas of study in terms of their relevance to the respondents' work were ranked as follows:

planning
research and evaluation
public policy processes
human resource policy and administration
organizational management theory
budgeting and financial management
personnel and labor relations
sociology
economics
labor economics

Respondents indicated they would prefer to hire an assistant or associate with a degree in the following areas in rank order preference:

public administration (65%)
human resource administration
social work
other
business administration
economics
psychology
sociology

Using the results of the survey, Buntz suggests a curriculum outline for the training of human service administrators.

1. Management Core (12 semester hours)
   A. Organization and Management Theory
   B. Program Budgeting and Fiscal Administration
   C. Quantitative methodologies in decision-making
   D. Management information systems
2. Public Affairs Core (9 semester hours)
   A. Public policy and administration
   B. Research and evaluation in public administration
   C. Public policy analysis
3. Human Service Concentration (24 semester hours)
   A. The administration of human resource policy
   B. Human service program planning
   C. Elective courses (9 hours)
   D. Internship, thesis, or additional course work option (6 hours)
   E. Capstone seminar

One final example in a specific professional area will be sufficient to complete a very general background from which to consider the issues and concerns discussed in this work. We have selected an example of specific subject content in order to integrate the earlier general statements into the study of specific educational content. Feldman (1974), suggesting that there is a current need to identify and assess curricula for mental health administration programs, offers a curriculum outline. (We have included only the major headings.)

HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

MENTAL HEALTH ECONOMICS
- **Basic Concepts in Economics and Their Adaptation to the Mental Health Field**
- **Financing of Mental Health Programs**
- **Costs and Benefits of Mental Health Programs**
- **Factors Affecting the Demand and Supply of Mental Health Programs**

PART I: BACKGROUND IN THE PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE

MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM EVALUATION

- Basic Concepts of Evaluation
- The Role of Evaluation in the Planning and Administration of Mental Health Programs
- Problems and Issues in Mental Health Program Evaluation
- Research Methods in Evaluation
- Data Collection
- Relevant Statistics
- Critical Analysis of Selected Mental Health Evaluation Studies

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH

- The Community Mental Health Center
- Community Resources in Mental Health—Roles and Relationships
- Community Mental Health Training
- Research in Community Mental Health
- Community Mental Health in Other Countries
- Field Visits to Community Mental Health Programs

EXECUTIVE ADMINISTRATION OF MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS

- Planning
- Budgeting and Accounting
- Law
- Administrative Theory and Practice
- Personnel
- Communications
- Information Systems
- The Physical Environment of Mental Health Programs
- Field Visits

GOVERNMENT PROCESS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

- The Nature of Federalism
- The Development of Professionalism, Technology and Grants-in-Aid and Their Significance for Intergovernmental Relations
- The Evolution of Typical Grants-in-Aid Programs such as the National Defense Highway Program and Health Programs
- The Importance of Federal Leadership and Financing
- Effect of Scientific and Social Developments on Intergovernmental Relations. State, Local Government and Regional Relationships in Health and Welfare
- The Process of Government

SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS OF MENTAL HEALTH

- The Social Dimension of Mental Health and Mental Disorders

Epidemiology
The Influence of Social Class, National Origin, Age, and Sex on the Development of Normal Deviant Behavior
Social Mobility, Group Cohesiveness and the Urban Environment as They Affect Mental Status
Social Influence and Mental Health
Differential Diagnostic and Treatment Services As Related to Socio-economic Status and Ethnic Background
Mental Health Facilities as Social Systems

ORGANIZATIONAL AND INTERORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR
The Characteristics and Classification of Formal Organizations
Schools of Thought
Informal Organization
Organizational Change
Organizational Theory in the Mental Health Field
Interorganizational Relations in Mental Health
Group Process — Individual and Small Group Behavior

MENTAL DISORDERS
The Biological Roots of Human Behavior
Mental Disorders
Treatment of Mental Disorders
Mental Health Personnel
Practicum

It is obvious that such a curriculum covers a wide range of academic fields that are not historically taught in a single department. It is also obvious, upon examining curricula in human services fields other than mental health, that many of these same subject areas are considered to be the curriculum content of *those* fields. And it should be obvious that this kind of overlapping content within the context of the university presents serious problems for all kinds of human services professional education programs. The same problems are seen within the various bureaucracies of human service organizations in the community, as well as the State and Federal levels.

Integrated Human Services Education

There are some writers who seem not to represent a single professional orientation in their consideration of human services education. That is, the changes they propose are based upon the assumption that a human services education program would not necessarily be housed within a department/school of social work, public administration, public health, education, medicine, or any other single field.

Interest in this cross-fields perspective of human services education appears to be quite recent and remarkably scarce. Paraprofessional education, a new type of career field, has been

the subject of numerous articles and books for many years, but we do not include that literature in our considerations since we have limited our study to the level of graduate education.

Butler and Bilorusky (1975) have described what they call a new curriculum for human services professionals. Curricula are conceptualized according to their degree of openness and the extent to which they allow and encourage the development of student autonomy. Performance models are considered to represent traditional curricula which emphasize conformity in pre-packaged components.

The authors see the closed contract model to be more open than traditional curricula but less desirable than the open contract model, which provides a broader process of negotiation between the student and instructor. In the fourth curriculum model is the "experimenting community" model learning experiences emerge from a process of interaction that integrates thinking and acting. This kind of curriculum involves a continuing dialectic between "script and improvisation," and avoids learning by exemplar and the rigidities of paradigms. Traditional curricula are seen by the authors as passively socializing students into the scripts of established agencies, just as they encourage students to learn uncritically the theories of the faculty. The attempt to integrate theory and action through field placement seminars they consider to be a "contrived attempt to effect a linkage of curricular structures".

The need for a new profession of human services has been discussed by Sunderland (1975). In answer to the question, what has happened to the quality of the professions, he suggests:

> . . . professionals themselves no longer publicly trust themselves to dispense service and no longer are confident that they are the best prepared for educating for service. Every major profession is currently racked by the reality that the admissions standards for entry into either the education for the profession or for the profession itself are irrelevant to actually predicting successful practice; that so-called "standards of conduct" are totally unrelated to standards of actual practice; that the elements of a service relationship which really serve the client are as unknown to the professional as to the client; that malpractice is a concept gaining in legitimacy for teachers, counselors, and social workers as well as doctors and lawyers; and that fundamentally, the professions may be contributing more to the problems of sickness, mental illness, racism, injustice, and death than to the opposite.

For different professions Sunderland describes some of the alternatives that are being practiced against the opposition of the tradition of the profession. Consumers/citizens/clients are beginning, in medicine, to classify practitioners by quality, encourage national legislation to open the process of recertification, and develop new delivery models based upon concern for women, minorities, or the aged.

In community mental health, these same citizens are forcing a new approach to professional services making them accountable both to the client and to the community. Citizens are influencing a movement of change in the legal profession through monitoring, publicity, class-action suits, and citizen-action groups who force changes concerning citizen rights, environment, safety, political corruption, discriminatory practices, and services to a wider group of people.

Professionals in education are being forced by citizens to develop more realistic approaches that will be subject to continuous monitoring of institutional and professional success and failure. In the welfare and corrections area, citizens have forced major changes in the social work profession, "professionals being demonstrably less effective in rehabilitation processes than nonprofessionals."

Sunderland further presents six assumptions upon which the "new profession" should be based:

1. Opening a profession that encourages widespread support for service which produces results in the client's interests.

2. Tying together the service agencies and training institutions into new configurations aimed at accelerating the amount and improving the quality of service.

3. Constructing a new concept of "performance knowledge" which will document and direct the methods of service aimed at consequences of importance for the client.

4. Strengthening of political and educational relationships between professionals and clients so as to promote individual and institutional structures of better service.

5. Maintaining the important qualities of humaneness as much during and after professional training as before.

6. Continuing commitment to examining the competence of practitioners to expand knowledge, to increase sensitivity, and to confront mediocrity and ill-will.

Sunderland's organizational basis and example for the propositions is the College of Human Services in New York City. Its program is described in more detail in Part III.

It is surprising that, at this writing, there are only three books available dealing with human services education in the contemporary perspective of the human services movement in the field; that is, works considering human services education *across* fields. Although the Gartner book (1976) came out more than a year later than the first *cross-fields* book and almost a year later than the second, we will discuss it first to set the stage for the other discussions that will follow.

In *The Preparation of Human Service Professionals,* Gartner proposes that "the issue is not whether or not there should be preparation of human service practioners, but rather how to make that preparation most effective." Some of the factors involved are internal to professional preparation, such as content, faculty, teaching methods, relationship of theory and practice, place of training, and others; and other factors are involved externally, such as, "who are admitted to the preparation, at what point in their lives, according to what standards, and how the training is related both to professional practice as well as to larger societal developments."

The major portion of the Gartner book is devoted to analyzing and describing in separate chapters the education of doctors, lawyers, social workers, and teachers. In his concluding chapter, having compared and contrasted the four professions, he makes the following propositions:

1. The dichotomy between practice site where one learns practice skills and university classrooms where one learns theoretic knowledge does not stand up to analysis. Each

location offers opportunities to learn both: theoretical issues can be understood and tested at the practice site just as practical matters can be learned and discussed in the university classroom.

2. But the mere cumulation of the two is not enough . . . (the necessary features) can best be developed in a new setting, the simulational training site . . . (It) provides the opportunity for trainees as a group to meet together, to share experiences, to analyze problems, to try out differing strategies and practices in role plays, microteaching, and simulations, to test out in actual practice strategies which have been developed, and then to rehash them in the simulational laboratory, to engage in mutual critiques, and then to try out alternatives.

3. The agency as a whole must be willing to take on the burden of being a training site, of establishing a broad range of relationships with the professional training schools, of involving the full staff of the agency in the activities of practitioner preparation with persons moving sequentially and cyclically through roles as trainee, practitioner, and trainer.

An earlier book by Chenault (1975) deals with human services education within the context of human services in community systems; that is, following the current trend away from categorical, fragmented, competitive services toward more comprehensive, integrated, and collaborative services. Her "organic model" attempts to practice *within* an education program the same kinds of changes that are occurring in other parts of the community, especially in human services systems and organizations.

The Organic Model applies equally to philosophical or conceptual bases, organizational bases, program development and implementation, program evaluation, and operational elements of curriculum in human services education. The "new mentality", which she suggests is demanded for the human services movement, would include:

1. *Horizontal aspects* (across professions, across organizations, across systems, across communities, across states, across institutions, across people, and across areas of social need);

2. *Vertical aspects* (from paraprofessional to professional, from recipients to providers, from individual citizens to local communities to federal programs); and

3. *Interrelational aspects* (the interrelationships among all of the above — interrelationships that take on more complex forms than the accumulation of uni- and duo-directional relationships).

The program that was developed from this model is described more fully in Part IV.

The coordinators of this program have further elaborated on the education of human services personnel (Chenault and Mermis, 1976). In this work, they offer: a) alternatives to the traditional assumptions associated with university training of human services personnel, b) a content

model for human services graduate education, c) problems that can be expected in program development, and d) "prevention" concepts that can be applied in the development of education programs.

One of the final pieces of background literature is included in Part II of this monograph: the report of the California Conference: Human Services and Higher Education: Business As Usual or New Directions? A second outcome of the California Conference will be a book on the same subject by the authors of this monograph, due for publication in Spring, 1978.

The Organizational Context for Human Services Programs

As we have said with respect to other topics in this monograph, it is not our intention to provide a complete review of the literature in any of the subtopics. Rather, our intention is to provide a general backdrop from which one can consider the many issues of human services graduate education.

In 1972 the Council of Graduate Schools commissioned a panel on Alternate Approaches to Graduate Education. Its report, *Scholarship for Society*, indicated that significant modifications needed to be made in order for graduate schools to meet fully the emerging needs of society.

The panel's recommendations included: 1) every graduate student should be required to undertake off-campus work in his major field to insure that no advanced degree candidate graduates without exposure to real working situations; 2) graduate school faculty should be encouraged to take a wider view of their professional roles; 3) institutional policies should be altered to allow faculty members more time to play larger roles in the solution of major societal problems and such community activity could play a part in measuring faculty performance; and 4) more experts who do not possess the usual academic credentials should be added to graduate school faculties.

To accommodate the changing realities suggested by this and many other such reports, the university as an organization has come under special scrutiny in the past decade. Professionals with expertise in organizational processes have provided some guidelines for organizational change. One such example is Lippitt (1975) who presented seven organizational conditions that he felt affect the way trainers see themselves and conduct their jobs:

1. Organizations will require new structures and new processes to cope with changing demands.

   Traditional structures will not be adequate . . . To permit an organization to be proactive rather than reactive, matrix organization concepts will emerge . . . A greater emphasis will be placed on processes and systems within the organization that will permit self-renewing activities.

2. Many jobs and skills will become obsolete at an increasing rate.

   The continued rapid growth of a service-oriented society will cause change for many organizations and jobs . . . New methods of training and development will place greater emphasis on creativity and innovation . . . It will become increasingly futile to teach for jobs already in existence.

3. People will insist on a greater opportunity to be a meaningful part of the organization.

   The old way of inducing people to be loyal to the organization will no longer be appropriate. Individuals will be increasingly concerned with their own self-actualization and will be loyal to themselves rather than to organizations . . . Organizations will need to set targets and objectives, particularly in relation to the development of human resources.

4. Conflict, confrontation, coping and feed-back will continue.

   Millions of good productive ideas have been lost in organizations where the climate does not allow for honest differences in judgments and opinions . . . We must strive to avoid a win-lose concept in organizational and societal life and substitute wherever possible the concept of win-win. Openness, candor, and frank feedback should not be equated with hostility or obstructionism . . . those who shut off the ideas and contributions of their subordinates are really the obstructionists . . . changing reward systems in organizations will provide a means of rewarding new kinds of behavior and affecting organization change.

5. The explosion of knowledge and technology will continue.

   . . . education must be viewed by everyone as a continuing life-long process. We need to avoid preoccupation with terminal degrees and place greater emphasis on continued education . . . work and life must become more meaningfully related . . . money alone is an insufficient motivator. Work itself must be viewed as a basic source of satisfaction. The implications for education and training are that organizational objectives, individual performance objectives and education objectives will need to be integrated; and in education, process and content must be integrated . . . Training and development must help people learn how to learn . . . people must have a greater control over their own development and learning processes . . . training personnel should view themselves more as managers of training and development resources, and less as teachers.

6. There will be a need for a more effective interface between government, education, and industry.

   . . . education and development personnel will move in and out of specific training positions. They will widen their perspective by working in various types of organizational systems and developing collaborative skills with organizational systems other than their own.

7. The emergence of underutilized groups must be recognized.

   Underutilized resources must be recognized at both individual and organizational levels . . . new ways to interpret and train people for the world of work will be required. This will require an ever-continuing involvement in creating new designs for effectively developing the capabilities of human resources.

CURRENT STATE OF HUMAN SERVICES PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

The Schien report (1972), written for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, is relevant to this study because it deals with some of the same issues being discussed today by human services professionals. While there have been changes between 1972 and 1977, there are nevertheless some important points in this report that help to fill in the historical picture for human services professional education. (However, the reader will notice that a number of conclusions in the Schein report are still more contemporary today than most university professional education programs.)

Information for the Schein study was gathered by interviewing approximately 75 professionals selected on the basis of their innovative roles. Thus, while the author skims what was going on in higher education in 1972, he gains depth by learning more about those individuals interviewed. The professions represented in his interviews were law, medicine, architecture, engineering, management, and university teaching.

A few of the characteristics of the contemporary human services movement are touched on in the author's discussion of the changing needs of society, work environments, and client needs. Three trends of maturing professions were identified by Schein: 1) they become more convergent in their knowledge base and standards of practice; 2) they become more highly differentiated and specialized; and 3) they become more bureaucratized and rigid with respect to their own career alternatives.

Schein describes the tension between convergent and divergent modes of thinking:

> How does one ensure that the student gets a thorough grounding in the convergent underlying disciplines if he wants to get involved in the more divergent activities associated with project work and client contact? Thus, professors in medical school are concerned about student indifference to biochemistry, professors in law school are worried that students will start "clinical" activities before they have learned to think like lawyers, and architecture professors are concerned that the pressure toward social relevance will undermine student motivation to really learn design principles throughly . . . in each case it is . . . acknowledged that learning the basic science requires a certain discipline and motivation that may be eroded by the glamor of getting involved in live projects.

Integrating the convergent and divergent elements in professional education is suggested as the way out of this dilemma.

The author proposes four general directions toward which professional education should move:

1. More flexibility in the professional school curriculm, in the number of paths available through the school, in the number of electives available to students inside and outside the school, in the pacing and sequencing of courses, in the required length of time needed to go through school, and in the degree or certification process used by the school.

2. More flexibility in the early career paths of professionals, more differentiated rules for licensing to reflect different kinds of professional careers, and more support by the profession itself of role innovation of various kinds.

3. New curricula and new career paths which are inter- or transdisciplinary and which may lead eventually to new professions that have new blends of knowledge and skill underlying them.

4. Complete integration of the behavioral and social sciences into the professional school curriculum at three different levels: 1) basic psychology, sociology, anthropology, and economics as part of the basic science core of professional education; 2) applied behavioral science dealing with the theory and practice of planned change, diagnosis of complex systems, and analysis of client-professional relationships; and 3) applied behavioral science dealing with self-insight, social responsibility, learning how to work in and lead professional teams, and learning how to learn.

The model of planned change proposed includes three stages: unfreezing mechanisms, changing mechanisms, and refreezing mechanisms. These stages appear to be another way of phrasing creating readiness for change, implementing change, and stabilizing the change created.

The suggested mechanisms applicable to formal professional education are:

- Self-paced study
- Independent study
- Concentrated study
- Small-group and seminar-tutorial methods
- Project- or problem-centered study
- Practicum or clinical experience
- Work-study programs, off-campus study, co-op programs and internships

It can be seen that these mechanisms, even for 1972, are the usual rather than unusual methods. Schein indicates that his intention was to highlight innovative uses of traditional mechanisms.

In the final chapter, called "Some Bold Horizons", four major changes are listed as necessary for a genuinely different and more responsive professional education: 1) new kinds of learning modules built on better theories of how students learn; 2) new kinds of faculty members who bring different skills, attitudes, and values to their job; 3) new kinds of administrative structures and procedures that are more flexible and that adapt to the learning tasks to be met; and 4) perpetual self-diagnosis and evaluation research.

In summary, the new professional school would:

1. . . . Start with a learning theory that integrates basic sciences, applied sciences, and professional skills within single learning modules . . . ;

2. Be organized around learning modules of varying lengths and would permit the putting together of different patterns of modules, dealing with different professional career foci, leading to different kinds of professional degrees which would require different lengths of time to complete;

3. Have a small permanent faculty and larger part-time adjunct faculty to permit the offering of a wide variety of modules to students . . . ;

4. (Be physically organized) around a learning resource center that should include as many laboratories and applications-oriented subcenters as possible, much like a teaching hospital that is tied closely into various community service activities;

5. (Be administratively) highly decentralized, using only those information and control procedures that would facilitate the student's learning process and keep track of information about the student that he and his future employers really need;

6. Avoid the search for standardized solutions to curriculum questions, engaging instead in a perpetual process of self-diagnosis and research on the outcomes of its educational efforts.

Mahew (1974) refers to the unresponsiveness of graduate schools to alternate designs which, he says, "condemns many people to a lifetime of second-rate status in powerful areas largely irrelevant to their training (e.g., irrelevent to careers in government, industry and management, social work, and . . . health-related fields)."

Included in the program areas discussed by Mahew are departmentalism, concept and structure of academic degrees, accreditation, organizational forms, faculty division of time between research and teaching, and institutional role. Some of the major issues which the author considers related to reform in professional education are: "institutionalized" programs, job opportunities for students, the problem of providing broad exposure in social sciences and the humanities, accommodating future practitioners (especially with respect to applied experience), social/educational relevance of training programs, financial aid, curricular balance, economic balance, and training/retraining on the part of professionals in terms of expense/reward ratios.

One final report is discussed here because, in our opinion, it best covers considerations for future change in higher education. The Perkins report for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1973) includes some concluding perspectives on the future of the university as an organization. They offer perhaps the best background from which to consider future possibilities for human services professional education. Perkins predicts that changes in the mission of universities will approximate this:

1. Instruction will remain the central mission but student choice will increasingly outweight faculty prescription.

2. Large-scale research will gradually shift to nonuniversity institutions.

3. The residential campus will give way to off-campus living systems. Nonresidential institutions such as community colleges will have a comparative cost advantage which will become increasingly attractive.

4. Service to the public will decline dramatically in some areas, such as defense and space; continue with minor modifications in agriculture, medicine, and engineering; and may substantially increase in urban affairs, ecology, race relations, and international organizations, both public and private.

5. The democratic impulse will dominate systems of governance leading to representation, election, and consensus rather than appointment and decision making by highest independent legal authority.

6. The locus of power to plan and allocate resources will continue to gravitate toward the managers of systems and from private to quasi-public and public coordinating bodies . . . Both the university board and its chief executive will, as a consequence, be increasingly subordinated to a web of influence and controls that involve both lower and high authority. This development will persist, expand, and determine the direction of affairs on the campus.

Probable organizational change, Perkins believes, can be projected from the above redefinition of the university's mission.

1. Boards of individual institutions will become less powerful . . . being caught between two forces: the university and the state or society.

2. University organizations that are representative of the various internal constituencies will emerge. (Boards of governance will be reduced to ratifying institutional decisions rather than making them).

3. The president will become an elected official, nominated by the university senate and approved by the board, for a limited term. (He will increasingly follow the course of the corporate executive, becoming less visible as a personality.)

4. Chief administrative officers will also be selected with the participation of those who work under them. Administrative accountability will become the order of the day.

5. Administration will become more simplified as the missions of research and public service are reduced in scope and as the residential features of the university are progessively abandoned.

6. The university will become less of a community in the sense of a geographic and social entity as it becomes more of a community based on professional interest. The idea of the community of scholars lost its geographic imperative decades ago. The faculty member's closest ties are no longer necessarily to colleagues in the same department or on the same campus; rather, they extend to national and international associations of professional peers.

7. The university will take many new forms, once freed of its geographic definition. A variety of new organizations will burst forth reflecting the new realities of greater numbers of students, increased costs, and demands for relevance.

8. The new organizations are just beginning to emerge. TV classrooms, the open university, industry-based education, training and retaining by cassettes, degrees granted by nonuniversity authorities — all these developments foreshadow the birth, perhaps the rebirth of a new kind of higher education.

9. In most institutions present arrangements will continue largely intact. The form will remain even as the substance is disappearing. But the interim — while structure catches up with change — will require a far more political sytle. Votes must be sought, conflicting interests resolved, accountability of performance accepted and acted upon. And just as the city must relate to the State and Federal governments, so too must the new university become not only internally accountable to its constituencies but externally accountable to society.

The projected future directions proposed by this report are so powerful and so intimately joined with the contemporary issues of human services education that one cannot help wonder what new projections Perkins would make in light of the events and conditions of the past four years.

These projections support the suggestion that future human services program development must be planned and carried out as a part of the larger organization's development (Chenault and Mermis, 1976). It can also be seen why there will be such difficulty for program developers to scale the walls of the university organization-fort which continues to struggle and fight against the realities of the "outer" environment of which it is a part. For human services as a movement — and human services education programs of the future that correspond with it — represent this reality which the university continues to resist.

It will be interesting to follow the national trends for the next few years and to note when, or whether, the university will come to see this "outer" reality as an opportunity rather than as an adversary or nonexistent shadow.

PART II: THE CALIFORNIA CONFERENCE REPORT

Major Issues and Recommendations for Change

Over the past year, the Human Services Center at the University of Southern California has been in contact with approximately two hundred universities and colleges throughout the nation. These contacts helped to begin an assessment of the "State of the Art" of human services professional programs in higher education. The contact mechanisms used were: a survey instrument, personal visits, correspondence, and phone communication.

For over two years the academicians who have been involved in establishing human services programs in their respective universities have felt a need to come together to share ideas, programs, and future directions. Indeed, the fact that it has taken so long to obtain even minimal funding for such a meeting is indicative of the difficulty of securing financial support for programs to address human services and higher education.

Although we have been aware that there is a wide variance in goals, objectives, and philosophical/theoretical assumptions in the human services movement, many of us, at the same time, believe that significant and positive change will not take place in the delivery of human services until many changes occur in the education and training of human service professionals.

With support from U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Services, a conference was convened at the Davidson Conference Center for Continuing Education, University of Southern California, in February, 1977. The title of this event was *Human Services and Higher Education: Business as Usual or New Directions?* Fifty human service academicians, practitioners, and government representatives[1] considered present and future needs of higher education programs in human services and their relationship to "real world" needs. A work-forum was utilized to react to the major issues which had been identified through a participatory planning process.

---

[1]Appendix III, Roster of Participants

CURRENT STATE OF HUMAN SERVICES PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

In this section we have summarized the deliberations of the task teams. We wish to point out that this event is one point along a continuum in an emerging and changing human services professional belief system and socio-political response to community, family, and individual needs. We encourage readers of this monograph to continue consideration of the issues and would especially welcome a sharing of ideas. This can be accomplished by communicating ideas to the Human Services Center, College of Continuing Education, University of Southern California, University Park, Los Angeles, California 90007. We hope to utilize new information and new ideas in future updating of the state of human services graduate education.

Major National Issues for Human Services and Higher Education

Conference participants were, in many ways, part of the planning process. Short commentaries were requested of participants prior to the conference. These commentaries were used in preparing the major issues as well as in developing the conference structure. Sample commentaries are abstracted below:

Agranoff	Five training strategies emerge from change strategies: 1) no single disciplinary approach; 2) conceptualizing the field from a unique systems perspective, independent of single categorical service; 3) attention to a wide range of concerns; 4) focus on services, purposes, and outcomes; and 5) focus on policy at supra level, independent of programs.
Blakely	There is a need to develop stronger training in all aspects of human services administration. We need more or better texts, journals, and professional workshops in this arena. We should call together interested persons to develop teaching resources in the full range of learning materials.
Broskowski	There are important differences between evaluation research and program evaluation. It is the focus on internal improvement of local and ongoing programs, their accessibility, effectiveness, and efficiency that distinguishes program evaluation from similar but distinctive endeavors.
Buntz	Human resource problems are interdisciplinary, so education programs designed to prepare administrators should also be unified and intergrated with a common conceptual framework.
Burnford	In spite of the lack of support from formal systems, legislation, political figures, or funding sources to bring about much needed change in human services higher education, a network of educators, practitioners, and governmental persons have formed mutual support systems that seem to be open to all who are committed enough to "buy in" to this important experiment in social change.

Chenault

The ideal for human services education would require drastic change. Some constraints that push against the efforts for significant change are: 1) the nature of federal legislation; 2) the organizational structure of the Executive Branch; 3) diminishing incentive mechanisms; 4) the forces of university bureaucracies and professionalism upon human services educators.

Mermis

Six major areas represent my major focus for human services education: 1) private and public strategies for development of human services education and practice; 2) implications for continuing education models; 3) the various dimensions of "categoricalness"; 4) development of formalized linkages with significant other mechanisms and networks; 5) combining citizen participation and "paraprofessionalness" with support systems and networks; 6) human services information systems.

Palmiere

Action must be taken at all levels of activity to produce a synergistic result in which the total impact of all human services not only equals but actually exceeds the sum of its constituent elements. There is a need for creating and funding of demonstration programs as well as existing programs. Programmatic changes must be supported by changes in the infra-structure of higher education and human service environments.

Weiner

We need human services generalists to broaden the focus of already-trained specialist professionals. This requires developing curricular guidelines which should be done quickly and with HEW playing a critical role. We should embark on a nationwide search and analysis of curricula as a basis for human service curriculum guidelines.

Wertheimer

Specialization alone does not provide the prerequisites necessary for attending to all interrelated basic human needs. Successful ways of working with educators who have vested interests in their areas of specialization need to be developed and shared. One purpose of the conference should be to identify the present status of human services education and to set objectives for the months and years ahead.

Yessian

A key challenge facing higher education is to help existing or potential organizational generalists to understand the importance of a generalist perspective and to search for ways in which they can be effective in reflecting this perspective in organizational settings. In this context, the extent and nature of their relationships with clinical generalists would appear to be especially important.

On the basis of these and other suggestions, Burnford and Chenault developed the following major issues which formed the basis of the task force work of the California Conference.

Present Status and Future National Needs for Human Services Education

1. How can the present status of human services training in higher education be described generally?

2. What common definition or definitions of human services education are required for thoughtful communication among human service professionals in higher education, the Federal government, and human service systems at all levels?

3. What are the existing conceptual bases underlying human services professional education? Are they appropriate for present and future national needs? What general directions are indicated for national change in conceptualizing human services education in higher education?

4. What are the most useful relationships which should exist between current/evolving Federal legislation and national human services education? What specific recommendations should be made to university and government administrators for better meeting the staffing and training needs which integrated or coordinated human services generate?

5. What economic and political considerations should be taken into account with respect to the above issues? What actions or directions can be taken to best contend with economic and political constraints to the development of human services education programs in higher education institutions?

6. What serious problems associated with the above issues need immediate attention? Where does the responsibility lie for future actions, and what mechanisms can be suggested to best ensure that needed actions are taken?

Relationships Between Human Services Education and Human Services Practice

1. What relationships exist and/or should exist between the development of human services higher education programs and human service delivery? In what ways can these relationships best be established and maintained?

2. What kinds of arrangements can be suggested to enhance the relationships between human services programs in higher education and State and local government interests and needs?

3. How can the human service concepts of integration and coordination be actualized with respect to human services program development in higher education and in other community systems?

4. For what general professional roles and functions should human service professionals be prepared in order to contribute most significantly to present and future national societal needs?

Program Development Issues of Human Services Training in Higher Education

1. What are the positive and/or negative influences of specialized professional fields upon the design and character of higher education training programs? What is the most appropriate conceptual base for dealing with the generalist-specialist dimensions of human services education programs? Should human services education programs prepare professionals as generalist, specialists, both, neither, or other?

2. What are the realistic possibilities that existing professional fields and disciplines would be receptive to supporting and developing more "comprehensive" human services education programs? Or how can they be encouraged to be more receptive?

3. Are interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary concepts the best referents for human services program development? What other concepts may be useful for the special needs of human services professionals?

4. Can "comprehensive" human services education programs grow and improve within existing bureaucratic structures of higher education? Can or should new organizational arrangements be developed? If so, how can this best be accomplished as a national task?

5. What kinds of administrative leadership at the top of university organizational structures are required for significant change in human services education?

6. What changes in human services curricula are neccessary to effect national improvement in professional education of personnel? Are there existing human services programs in higher education that could serve as models for future program development nationally? What existing curriculum materials are available that represent desirable curricular directions for human services education? How can the development of new curriculum materials be encouraged and disseminated widely? How can the development of new programs be encouraged nationally?

Program Administration Problems in Human Services Education

1. What differences from traditional training programs are indicated for future human services programs with respect to selection, retention, and placement of students?

2. What unique needs associated with field work present human service education programs with special problems?

3. How can human resources needs for human services faculty best be addressed at the national level? What inservice, faculty development, continuing education arrangements are most appropriate for human services *educator* needs?

4. What special needs exist for human services student populations?

5. How can control for quality programs best be conceptualized? What are the implications of credentialing, assessment of learning methods upon the quality of human services education?

Program Evaluation

1. What program evaluation concepts and mechanisms would be most useful for the development and administration of higher education programs for human services personnel?

2. How can programs take into account more appropriately the effect of the students' education in terms of satisfying human service needs?

National Task Team Recommendations

The development of educational programs in human services must take into account the diversity of the movement and, in particular, two motivating forces:

- The futher refinement of human services as a specific multidisciplinary area of study and practice, and

- The incorporation of broad human service competencies in existing professional disciplines concerned with particular aspects of the human services system.

Within each direction, there is a set of normative assumptions that form a foundation from which to develop new training programs or to modify curricula to enrich existing programs. These assumptions are based on the notion that it is necessary to have a broader understanding of the effects of differing models of service delivery systems as they affect the service delivery recipient.

The goals of human service education and practice should be to develop service support systems that enhance individual self-sufficiency. The options for achieving these goals include the better utilization of Federal, State, and local programs and the creation of professional networks.

Our conceptual framework for human service education should be based upon the following assumptions:

- At the present, inadequacies exist in human services education. The needs of the practitioner, at this point, exceed the ability of higher education to meet them.

- The basis of human services education programs should be the treatment of individuals as ends in themselves, not as means to ends.

- The increasing complexity of our society necessitates the continuing education of professionals who specialize in particular aspects of services to human beings.

- The concern regarding dehumanization in our society places a demand on specialized professionals also to have knowledge and skills about general human needs and concerns, and about other specialized human services to which they relate.

- The pace of social, technological, and professional change may require a person to perform several different professional roles/functions in a lifetime that : (a) demand life-long professional development devoted to acquisition of new kinds of knowledge and skills; and (b) place a premium of the development of general qualities, such as versatility, flexibility, and self-assessment.

- With the increasing demands in society for (a) more choices in quality and quanity of human services, (b) greater humanization of services, (c) alternatives to traditional hierarchial/dependency models of human services, and (d) more efficient use of public and human resources, human services professionals need to develop knowledge and skills to create an environment in which the client is empowered to self-develop the tools and knowledge for decisionmaking, personal growth and development, and purposeful behavior.

- The human services professional should be aware of his own values, and refrain from imposing these values on clients. The rights of clients are respected. In addition, the human services professional assists clients in becoming more aware of their own values and in making decisions in the light of their comparison to the values of others and of society in general.

- Since many human services are provided within an institutional setting, we must be sensitive to interorganizational relationships that call for increased knowledge and skills in such areas as group dynamics, organizational development, and conflict management.

- The very spirit of our society is formed by participatory decisionmaking, respect for persons at all levels, interdependent activities, and non-hierarchical structures. Thus, it is imperative that institutions of higher education, particularly those training human service professionals who deal with non-professionalized segments of society, reflect these traditional American approaches in their own administrations.

Present Status and Future National Needs for Human Services Education

An appropriate description of the present status of human services education is *diverse.* There is diversity both in terms of the roles for which persons are being trained (policy development, administration, and service delivery) and approaches to that training (e.g., public affairs/administration, social work, the schools, colleges, or departments of human services).

The preliminary findings of the Chenault-Burnford study confirm the conclusion that there is no common definition of the term human services or of human services education. Human services is clearly an interdisciplinary field, but the survey indicates that programs purporting to train persons for careers in human services are largely uni-disciplinary. Thus, the term human services is often used to describe *pure* social work, health administration, public administration, counseling, and other traditional academic fields. "With few exceptions, when the term interdisciplinary is used, it refers to the use of elective courses which students take in schools and departments other than the degree-granting department." Chenault (1975) has observed that faculty in various programs, "generally regard human services to be minor extensions of their own fields of expertise."

Definitions

There is a variety of contexts within which the term *human services* is used and it has been noted that there is no single universally accepted definition of the term. When the term *human services* is employed, the users should consider:

The human services are comprised of some basic characteristics such as:

- The provision of more than one categorical service;
- That provision includes elements of client education as well as client care;
- The human services are intended to help people become self-sufficient; and
- Service is sometimes provided in areas where no *professionals* are engaged.

A new profession of human services may be emerging; and there is a movement which has developed to change and to integrate existing professions.

A number of alternative conceptualizations of the term human services exist. Among these are the following:

- In all of their work the aim of human service professionals is not simply to help people through some immediate crisis but to empower them; that is, to teach them the skills which they need to manage their own lives and to fulfill their potential as responsible and creative members of society.

- The aim of human service providers is to enable people to attain self-sufficiency and to help them develop the skills which they want and/or need if they are to reach their full potential as human beings.

- In planning contexts the term has been used to indicate the need for improved coordination and integration among health, educational, and similar service programs.

- In administrative contexts *human services* has been used to refer to the need for improved managerial systems and organizational structures through which the provision of services could be made more effective, efficient, and equitable.

- In clinical contexts, the term has been used to refer to the common purpose served by a variety of specialized professional and technical personnel.

- In education, the term has been applied to inter-professional, intra-professional, and trans-professional learning activities at several levels of educational endeavors.

Despite these seemingly disparate uses of the term human services there seems to be a core concept inherent in its application — that of holism. The use of the term human services can signify, then, a departure from the notion of categorical or narrow specializations, professions, technologies, and organizations, all of which profess to meet and serve individual and collective human needs. In summary, the use of the term frequently signifies an integrated and synergic approach to the attempt to meet human needs.

At the present stage in the development of human services education programs, continued experimentation and demonstration of various approaches should be sustained and expanded. Therefore, attempts to arrive at a consensus on any single definition of human services education would appear to be premature. However, it seems essential that all proposals for human services education make explicit the definitions related to the goals, knowledge, competencies, skills, and values involved in the program.

Relationships Between Federal Legislation and Human Services Education

At the present time, most Federal legislation provides authority and/or funding for categorical service programs and traditional education programs for existing professions. When available, authority and funds for educational experimentation are provided almost exclusively within the confines of existing professional disciplines. Thus, it is difficult to secure Federal funding for human services education programs which (1) cut across two or more existing professions, or (2) create an educational program for a newly defined human service practitioner.

For these reasons, it is recommended that: (1) explicit legislative authority and funding be developed in support of interdisciplinary human services education programs; (2) research and development funds be expanded and then utilized to develop and test new models of human services education; and (3) a national focal point be developed for leadership, technical support, and information exchange on behalf of the new and developing human services education programs. The logical locus for such a unit is in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with appropriate liaison with other Departments such as Labor and Housing and Urban Development.

Recommendations for actions to be taken by university administrators in order to better meet the staffing and training needs for human services education programs involve appropriate changes in the structure and process by which faculty are recruited, selected, evaluated, and rewarded within the university environment. Specifically, universities should provide incentives for the development of interdisciplinary teaching and research programs. This is felt to be necessary in order to attract and retain qualified personnel whose primary university affiliations will not be with traditional academic units.

It is recommended that government administrators consider changes in job descriptions and specifications, educational and experiential requirements, inservice and continuing education activities, service activity and outcome expectations, and resource allocations. Such changes are required if service mandates implicit in the movement toward integrated human services delivery are to be met. *In other words, changes should focus on organizational integration as well as on services integration.*

Relationships Between Human Services Education and Human Services Practice

The use of issue-oriented conferences across organizational lines can reinforce the integration of concepts and develop cross-professional approaches to service delivery.

- User-designed and controlled institutes should be developed to meet the training needs of the practitioner, sometimes drawing upon the resources of the academic world.
- Agencies and governmental units should define those areas of identified need in the local or State setting which can draw upon the research at the national level.
- There is a need for more effective use and monitoring of Intergovernmental Personnel Exchange Program (I.P.A.) mobility programs; the approach needs 'nourishment' by being built into the career education plans of employees.
- Within the university setting, practitioners could effectively be used as guest lecturers, team teachers, regular instructors, consultants, and/or curriculum builders.
- Advisory committees for curricula should include practitioners and clients to maximize communication and enhance the curricula.
- University courses offered within governmental agencies provide the additional benefit of increasing faculty understanding and awareness of the field setting, as well as conveniently providing additional academic experience for the practitioner.
- Educators, in their roles as active private citizens, could become more involved with the advisory committees and service boards of human services agencies.

- Human services education programs could become more proactive regarding the promotion of consumer awareness of current legislation and practice in the field.

- The possibilities for improved and integrated human services delivery resulting from interaction among volunteer and "for profit" sectors, government agencies and programs, and universities should not be overlooked.

Relationships Between Higher Education and Human Services Delivery

- Team relationships between practitioners and academicians should be developed with trade-offs and benefits to both parties, in the form of "ongoing internships." Faculty might be required to participate in such arrangements to maintain currency and relevance to the "real world." There should be mechanisms developed for continuing contacts between practitioners and academicians beyond the internship concept; perhaps by using newsletters, personnel exchanges, additional conferences for contact.

- There may be difficulty in establishing a trust relationship outside of the area of responsibility/accountability.

- Collaboration may be complicated by the complexity of modern organization. How can the outside "expert" gain an adequate understanding of the "turf" to provide effective collaboration?

- All parties need to understand that the development of human services perspectives and approaches are new, and that we are all part of a social experiment. This necessitates a change in focus from the "expert" syndrome to the notion of the building of a collaborative working arrangement in which student and teacher, academician and practitioner, learn together.

- Practitioners and academicians must begin to see the payoffs of online training and development for effective service delivery. This thrust might need to be institutionalized as a part of the career education expectations for practitioners, with varied approaches to sequences of work-training to meet individual needs.

- Incentive and reward systems (retention, promotion, tenure) for academicians must be redesigned to support the premise that it is the academician's responsibility to be in touch and current with happenings in the field. It is in the university's self-interest to provide and reward community service, because it produces more relevant education.

- Relationships should focus on the transition from student to practitioner. Orientation of practitioners at the point of entry to the agency must emphasize a realistic assessment of the agency's history, level of development, and current issues.

- Educational institutions should not perpetuate the mistakes that have been made in the government sector, but rather must challenge the myths and identify better ways of

doing business. Schools should take a proactive role that identifies new models and approaches and deals with available models, creating an appropriate blend of pragmatism and theory. A balance must be struck between *teaching* what is happening as opposed to *evaluating* what is happening.

- Education should respond to the need for better integration of *theoretical* and *skill* development.

- Both educators and practitioners should take a more active role in the education of the public to human services concerns — not only of the user, but of the general public as well. There is a need for a clearer relationship to the public served. Programs and people have not concerned themselves appropriately with education of their public, nor have they seen this as a *proper* role. Educational institutions ought to increase initiatives to enhance the public's understanding of human services programs and people. It is reasonable to expect that we might see such a thrust in an area such as energy conservation.

Economic and Political Considerations

There are several economic and political considerations which should be taken into account in any discussion of education for human services delivery, management, or policy development.

Most higher education institutions in this country face resource scarcities (human, financial, and physical) which make it difficult to develop new educational programs or even expand existing programs. Another very important economic factor which ultimately affects service provision is the relatively low economic status assigned to service providers compared to human service managers and administrators. Predictably, outstanding practitioners move from direct service roles to administrative roles and this can cause problems at both levels in the system.

Political/administrative factors to consider in human services education include civil service restrictions, the identity of marketability problems which human service generalists face, and legislative politics. Civil service systems tend to be categorically oriented and job seekers in the established professions are clearly more marketable than persons with degrees in human services. If there is no agreement on the definition of the field, it follows that graduates of human services programs are, in many respects, an unknown quantity.

To deal with these constraints human service educators should consider:

- Restructuring existing educational programs, utilizing existing sources of research and demonstration funds where appropriate.

- Developing new programs as experiments and demonstrations after a careful case for the need for such programs has been developed and presented.

- Working within civil service systems and with private provider agencies to change job descriptions and classifications so that they more accurately reflect actual duties.

- Working with private and public personnel systems in order to upgrade the economic status of providers.

- Encouraging the development of new coalitions of service providers, educators, unions, and others, which will support the above recommendations.

Program Development Issues of Human Services Training in Higher Education

Developing a conceptual base for dealing with the generalist-specialist dimensions of human services is critical. The fundamental program development questions are:

(1) What are the basic competencies needed by human services professionals?

(2) How do we look at or define the competencies?

(3) How do the competencies needed by the clinician differ from those needed by the administrator/planner/manager who works in organizational settings?

Recommendations for Future Change

A general framework indicating the basic competencies — substantive knowledge, practical skills, and analytical abilities — is a necessary starting point in the development of educational programs. Both theory and experience should serve as guides for defining competencies.

Practitioners must acquire a greater appreciation for the analytic skills more traditionally emphasized in public administration/management education programs. On the other hand, planners and administrators must acquire a greater appreciation for social processes and practitioner roles. The interactions between practitioners and administrators are critical and should be addressed more extensively and imaginatively in human service education programs.

A pluralistic approach to human service education is essential and should be encouraged. It is also important to recognize, however, that human services must strike a balance between the promotion of diversity, on the one hand, and the development of certain generally defined directions on the other. Feedback and synthesis should be an inherent, regular part of human service education programs; and, program evaluation of human service curricula should occur as an ongoing and vital part of human service education programs.

The information presented herein is value laden. An appreciation of value premises and considerations should be an important part of the education process itself.

Options for Program Development

Participants agreed that there are at least four basic options for developing comprehensive human service education within existing educational settings. These options are designed to

encompass continuing professional development, as well as preprofessional or professional training. In fact, since most practitioners were educated in programs which did not stress integrated human services, it is imperative that the initial effort heavily emphasize life-long professional development. The options discussed were:

- The creation of schools, departments, or separate programs in human service administration. Such programs would have both an identity with curriculum and a faculty designed to prepare human services managers for a wide range of activities with both practitioner and administrative components.

- The development within existing curricula of new courses in human services. Such courses should be provided for all of the helping professions training programs at a given university, college, or school.

- The designing of cross-disciplinary educational programs within colleges or schools. This type of program would utilize personnel in existing disciplines in new configurations to provide the requisite education for human services professionals.

- A careful description and analysis of the several historical forces which have led us to our present stage of development in human services conceptualization. The forces discussed are: (a) public health, social welfare, community mental health, and public administration; (b) Economic Opportunity Act, New Careers, various Human Resource programs, and Career Education; (c) by discipline-profession; (d) within sociological-economic-political contexts; and (e) by *ideological* analysis.

The approaches to the implementation of new educational systems, each with its own major advantages and liabilities, suggested by the group are:

- Government grants and support that encourage: (a) establishing human services programs; (b) requiring credentials in human services as a pre-requisite to certain Federal grants; (c) supporting existing programs; and (d) use of HEW resources to support the development of human services through existing or new funding sources. The reader is encourage also to review the previous discussion of the relationship between Federal legislation and human services education.

- Developing a critical mass or network of human service professional educators at the local, regional, and national level.

- Using innovative educational systems at existing colleges such as experimental and continuing education divisions and programs, or the like, to develop and promote human service systems.

- Assessment of local human service organizations' needs in designing relevant organization and course structures in existing colleges or teaching programs.

- Utilizing the 'good offices' of friendly administrators to develop processes within the institution for human service education.

Finally, the participants felt the continuing experimentation with organizational models for human service education should be encouraged at institutions rather than opposed.

There is a need to help human services professionals respond to recent changes in society leading to more emphasis on removing dependency and enhancing client self-development skills. A useful model for human services is holistic medicine where the patient rather than the physician is ultimately responsible for the patient's health — not the patient's illness. Furthermore, there exist needs to:

- Question the concept of *service* — it is preferable to enable clients to serve themselves better, to empower themselves.
- Examine the place of values in human services curricula.
- Introduce into the education of *all* human services professionals a common core of competencies.
- Receive constant feedback from the field about practitioners' needs and deficiencies in order to enable us continuously to update our notion of what the common core of competencies ought to be.

A National Continuing Education Unit has been suggested for the purpose of designing and delivering *mini-courses* for professional development. This mechanism would provide *status* certificates of completion.

Human Services Concepts/Program Development

Within higher education, human services programs must value: the development of the *whole* student, participation and involvement of the student in his learning experience, and collaborative student efforts as much as, if not more than, individual student output.

While the need for improved agency integration horizontally (among agencies) and vertically (among local/State/Federal arenas) exists, the efforts to coordinate and integrate social planning and physical planning must be emphasized. Educators might attempt to link not only those with common interests but also those with related interests in integration efforts between social planning agencies — such as human services planners and land use planners. Public and mental health planners should be included in the integration process.

Preparation for Professional Roles

Human services education should train students in the concept of comprehensive services and interagency coordination at the policy, planning, and delivery levels. Training should be designed to respond to the changing nature of service systems, and the accompanying need for new role definitions. Practitioners need to be able to anticipate changes, identify necessary changes in performance standards, and adjust to these changes.

CURRENT STATE OF HUMAN SERVICES PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

All indications point to the increasing difficulty of entering human services systems at the Federal level. While Federal employment is leveling off, the State and local arenas are expanding, and, as such, seem to be the proper human services training focus.

While there seems to be some question regarding the adequacy of training for practitioners within their specialty areas, some conference participants feel that sufficient opportunities for practitioner training within specialty areas exist. More attention, however, should be focused in the following areas, taking care to avoid biases toward any one discipline or area of study:

- Management, including contingency management.
- Policy development, planning, implementation and evaluation technology — such as the ability to identify problems, rank priorities, and move toward planned services.
- Preparation for program performance controls and measurement of outcomes which are emerging in social services.
- An emphasis on productivity, as evidenced by the direction toward zero-based budgeting strategies cn some agencies at the Federal level.
- The need for a proactive approach to services management.
- Balance between practical, field-directed skills/approaches and theoretical base. Faculty need to be encouraged to teach good basics (e.g., 'tried and true' approaches to evaluation rather than innovative but overly complicated approaches) that can be applied in the field setting. Innovative approaches should be pursued for their conceptual merit, but if they are completely unrealistic for the 'real world' setting, they can work against the best training of the student.
- Statutory and regulatory law.
- An understanding of the difficulties of services integration based on "turf" problems. A parallel problem of territoriality appears in human services training programs when working within existing university structures and attempting tb put together bits and pieces of existing programs to create an integrated human services perspective.
- The need for a process emphasis. Some examples include: (a) drawing people into participatory planning and implementation processes; (b) creating a matrix even though there is no formal organization to support; (c) focusing on team building; (d) training people in team development and conflict resolution; and (e) focusing on project management.
- Knowledge concerning the political process and its impact on program development and organization.

There remains a need for continued identification of weaknesses and voids in programs preparing human services professionals, inasmuch as roles and functions are subject to fluctuation and change beyond the specialist focus.

Preparation for professional activity necessitates an emphasis on the formal educational setting at the undergraduate and graduate levels, as well as career education and retraining at the midcareer point. Training in the educational setting might provide specific skill development to be augmented by additional inservice training appropriate to the field situation. It is possible that the development of process skills is best-suited to the inservice model.

Training programs must consider the problems of role definition existing in human service settings:

- Different role requirements exist at each of the local, State, and Federal levels.
- One's professional identity and affiliation as contrasted to one's role as a public servant or member of the public sector; the latter cuts across professional affiliations and focuses on the commonalities of members of the public sector.

Professional performance is contingent upon the development of a proper outlook and the inculcation of values during the students' training. The development of an appropriate orientation of *human services* professional norms at the undergraduate/graduate level is essential.

Training in the educational setting should teach us to be more modest. Becoming a professional does not mean one has to have all of the answers, but rather, that one focus on the formal educational process as a springboard to further development — education should give us not a love of knowledge but a love of learning.

The nature and diversity of current student populations (some returning practitioners with well-developed practical skills and some students with a need for both practical and theoretical training), creates a need to redefine *teacher* and *learner*. Rather than identifying and perpetuating a dichotomy between teachers and learners, we might consider a learning continuum that combines knowledge base and practical skills to fit the particular needs of any given student.

The legal and ethical issues of human service practices should be included in higher education curricula. Such issues should not be isolated as separate courses, but should be dealt with as fundamental parts of the development of a professional "outlook".

Human services practitioners and academicians must begin to increase the understanding of the public with regard to the purposes of services and *what we're all about*.

The practitioner has to be able to treat individuals at the delivery level; this is difficult because the practitioner is trained to work from data sets that identify problems from typologies which do not always reflect the actual problems. The practitioner has to be able to treat any individual as unique and operate on the premise that clients come with something to tell us.

Consideration must be giver to those aspects of higher education and practice in human services which tend to reinforce the use of categorical bases rather than comprehensive program development, such as standards used by accrediting associations and agencies.

The responsibility for future action does not reside with any single organization or group. A major part of the responsibility for initiating change, however, seems to lie with networks of professionals that can be developed and maintained through conferences and workshops, such as the 1977 California Conference.

Various mechanisms to ensure future action are also required. A follow-on workshop to the Human Services/Higher Education Conference — aimed at producing concrete detailed recommendations and/or proposals — could be productive, work on organizing such an effort should begin as soon as possible. A task force or study group such as that recently proposed by ASPA's Section on Human Resource Administration could be formed to define needs and outline appropriate courses of action. Universities which have or plan to have programs in human services could form linkages among themselves and with practitioner groups to work for the changes we have recommended above.

Finally, the momentum initiated at the California Conference should be nurtured and maintained. This can be accomplished through the mechanisms which we have recommended; but individuals with an organizational base, should assume the responsibility to see that these and other appropriate mechanisms are in fact developed. Aggressive leadership is necessary to sustain momentum and to implement the recommendations of this Conference.

Program Administration Problems in Human Services Education

Student Selection

At the undergraduate and graduate levels selection procedures vary among the human service areas; thus, comparison with traditional programs is difficult. Some undergraduate programs have used students who are currently in the program to evaluate applications. Other programs are making use of task performance testing related to the program purpose and content (e.g., doing a community needs assessment, developing a statement of client advocacy philosophy). These selection criteria were thought to be distinct from the emphasis on academic credentials normally associated with traditional programs. There was no consensus on what selection mechanisms or criteria would be critical in future human services programs.

There was general agreement that at the graduate level human services programs often have a preference for applicants with professional experience. In many instances this criterion was seen as facilitating the students' recognition of points of cross-service integration, or as giving the student a background on which to apply and integrate various program skills (e.g., program design, administration, evaluation, education of human service professionals). It was felt that less weight should be attached to traditional academic qualifications (e.g., grade point average, Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores) for the older student who is applying to graduate programs after having been out of school for a long period of time.

Student Retention

Many of the students in human service programs at the graduate level have had substantial professional experience prior to admission, having been out of school for considerable periods of time. This creates three major problems in terms of retention. First, these students are often

more cogently critical of curriculum and teaching methods and they may experience frustration at the lack of perceived connection between the program and their practice backgrounds. It was felt that in the future it would be necessary to make greater use of the students' pedagogical model that blends fieldwork (in this case, past experience) with classroom experience. Such students should also be of critical assistance in undergraduate teaching.

It is perhaps paradoxical that a second problem for the students who have much to offer in the classroom is special difficulty with academic modes of learning. They are often unprepared for the rigors of writing papers, taking tests, and designing and executing original research projects for advanced degrees. A third problem related to the amount of professional experience many students bring to a graduate program is that these individuals tend to have developed life styles that make it difficult to adjust to graduate student 'standards of living.' Many have families to support, are accustomed to higher salary levels, and are occasionally induced to return to career positions. Human services programs face special problems in finding adequate stipend support and for conscientious evaluation of the quality of education that they are providing.

A retention issue cited with respect to undergraduate students was that they often experience motivational problems as a result of not seeing clear or satisfying placement opportunities resulting from human services training programs. In this regard, the development of mechanisms that provide direct feedback to students on placement experiences of program graduates was thought to be critical as a means of coping with certain retention problems.

While there was sharp disagreement from some, several group members felt that undergraduate students in human services programs often had less ability with academic skills, particularly in the quantitative areas. A problem for the future of these programs would be (a) to make clear that they were not a way to "short cut" the educational process, (b) to establish clear lines with appropriate remedial programs in the college or university, and (c) to emphasize the importance of verbal (writing, in particular) and quantitative skills in job performance circumstances.

Placement

In addition to the placement issues discussed above, the group felt that the student who receives a degree labeled *human services* may have problems with the perceived legitimacy of the credential in some job settings. Emphasizing the cross-programmatic or cross-disciplinary nature of the degree may or may not be helpful depending on the needs of and structural limits of the employer. Thus, for example, while cross-program planning, evaluation, management, and delivery may be increasing at all levels of government, categorical programs in some form will surely remain as a form of service delivery.

The problem is one of finding the appropriate placement for the student. Students who advertise cross-program or service integration skills may have some difficulty finding adequate placements. As an aid in identifying the range of job possibilities, the group felt that it would be useful to have a compilation and distribution of student placements at graduate and undergraduate levels for the human services programs represented at the Conference. Finally, it was stated that, due to rapidly changing community needs and modes of service delivery, training programs must give special attention to monitoring the fit between the education the student receives and the kinds of agencies and roles into which the student is placed. This would be a critical aspect of the general evaluation of a program's quality.

It was pointed out that the remarks on selection, retention, and placement emphasized the full-time student. Several individuals noted that human services training programs have an

obligation to maintain efforts in continuing education for inservice professionals who would benefit from part-time educational opportunities. There was a feeling that faculty who might teach in continuing education programs, needed special competencies to relate to the perspectives and needs of the working professional. These competencies were not discussed in any detail.

Human Services Field Work

Although unique needs associated with field work present human service education programs with special problems, the group felt that many issues are pertinent to fieldwork in general, while some relate more specifically to human services. Several of the needs and problems listed are particular to human service programs that emphasize the development of service integration or coordination skills:

- It is often difficult to find agencies that can provide field experiences appropriate to the educational objectives of a human services program, especially when a *cross-program* as opposed to *categorical* placement is desired. The location of the educational institution will have a obvious effect on this issue, as will as other problems identified below. Adequate supervision in the field is also problematic, especially where students wish to gain a cross-program or multiple skill (e.g., evaluation and management) perspective.

- Identifying and evaluating the educational objectives of the field experience may be difficult when there is disagreement among students, faculty, and placement supervisors regarding the scope of the experience. Among undergraduates in particular, there may be a need to push the student to broaden the perspective of the field experience from delivery of a specific service to related skills and service areas.

- There is a problem with integrating field experience and classroom concepts and theories. This is complicated in the human services area due to the change in the services environment (e.g., political, economic, technological) which requires a flexible curriculum.

- There is an important need to communicate the educational goals of field work as a part of human services curriculum to the traditional academic community. Closely related to this issue is the need to legitimize the field experience function as an integral part of the human service education role.

- Several programs make use of research and training projects to provide field work experience for students, primarily at the graduate level. These are felt to be very useful vehicles for understanding the issues and tensions related to social science research and human services policy development. An inherent problem is the uncertain availability of such projects and the need for staff to maintain continuing efforts in the development of project proposals.

- As with career placement opportunities, it was felt that all human service education programs would benefit from a shared list of field placement models and practices.

Faculty Development and Continuing Education Programs

There was widespread agreement on the need for continuing education and faculty development programs that would serve to keep educators sensitive to the service delivery environment and practitioners (managers, evaluators, planners, deliverers) abreast of changing methodologies and theoretical perspectives. There was some support for the idea of faculty-practitioner exchange programs along the lines of the Intergovernmental Personnel Exchange Program (I.P.A.). It was noted, however, that universities often impose restrictive financial arrangements in terms of their contribution to salaries that would prevent such exchange programs from operating effectively. As an alternative it was suggested that HEW establish a grant fund to which human services faculty and practitioners could apply for support in exchange program efforts.

Rapidly changing technology with respect to program management, planning, delivery methods, and revenue development argue for regular inservice programs for human service professionals. Programs aimed at educators and practitioners need to stress issues specific to service areas, as well as the contributions of allied disciplines and program areas. It was felt that there is a need for additional mechanisms, along the lines of Project SHARE, to assess and disperse information about changing technologies in human services. Such mechanisms should include attention to curriculum, field work, and job placement issues in human services education. While there is an increasing need to recruit faculty who embody competencies relating to cross-program (e.g., health and welfare) and cross-skill (e.g., evaluation and management) areas, budget restrictions in many universities prevent necessary hiring. Many human service programs will have to buy or borrow services from other disciplines in the university. This may create problems related to the desired integration of disciplinary perspectives in the human services curriculum. Team teaching may represent a method for preserving integrated perspectives on human service issues.

Human services education programs often ignore in their curriculm the preparation of future human service educators. Several programs give explicit attention to this aspect of a student's education. However, it was felt that more programs should emphasize the preparation of human service educators as a means of meeting future needs particular to the human services.

Program Quality

In reviewing the costs and benefits of several approaches to assessing program quality, the group reacted more favorably to using methods of internal program review than to outside accreditation. Some of the reactions to this point are as follows:

- Credentials may lead to a heightened sense of identity, status, and influence among human service professionals.

- Credentials could serve as a lever for requiring continuing education as a means of maintaining competent human service professionals.

- It is not clear that a professional group now exists that would be suitable for the credentialing or accrediting tasks, given the variety of programs that fall under the label of *human services*. Some groups in the human service field already accredit programs, such as Public Administration, Nursing, Social Work, etc. It is considered by some members of the team to be superfluous to talk of another, more encompassing accrediting body.

- Credentials and accreditation may lead to decreased flexibility of program design.

- Accreditation of curriculm may be more desirable than acquiring individuals with credentials, given the difficulty of specifying the skills and/or knowledge that would be tested. Some programs, however, have developed competencies at the graduate level that are currently used as the basis for internal program review.

- Accreditation of curricula could operate as a safeguard against those programs that have changed in name but have not addressed themselves to the broad range of cross-disciplinary skills necessary in human services education.

- To the extent that human service professionals represent an emerging coalition of professions, they can enhance their status within academia by external accreditation. With respect to internal program review, the group endorsed the idea of continuing self-evaluation activities, with responsibilities perhaps being assigned to a formal program position or as part of each faculty member's educational function. Self-evaluation can be conceptualized from three perspectives:

  Program: Each program should begin to develop a list of competencies and knowledge appropriate for educating human service professionals who are capable of applying a range of skills from delivery to management to evaluation and education, across several service areas.

  Functional: Each program should evaluate the proportion of students placed in appropriate human service positions. In addition, programs can assess the quality of the match between student capabilities as developed by the program and their utility in human service agencies.

  Quality of Services: Each program should make some effort to assess its program by measuring the impact of graduates on the quality of human services delivery from the perspective of the client.

In the short run, it would be desirable to continue to raise questions about quality control; a long-range strategy should aim toward identification and broad acceptance of competencies for human services education.

PART III: HUMAN SERVICES EDUCATION REPORT

The National Survey of Human Services Education

The evolution of contemporary human services directions in the community can be traced through the professional literature of a number of fields, such as mental health, public administration, urban planning, health administration, social work, or criminal justice. Most human service organizations reflect these changes in some way, and there are a number of common threads or dimensions in each field. These general *human services* characteristics have been discussed by professionals in this field (see the Introduction of this monograph).

While such common human services directions are identifiable with respect to human service systems at the community, State, and Federal levels, they are not identifiable in the same way with respect to higher education programs that train human services professionals. There are some common directions (e.g., the trend toward a broader scope of interest) among training programs in the various professions; but the major characteristics of human services in the field, seem not to have penetrated higher education.

A number of surveys and studies have sought to bring current information regarding human services education to the attention of professionals (Becker and Smith, 1974; Bloom and Parad, 1976; Commission on Education for Health Administration, 1974; Council on Social Work Education, 1974; Denbow and Nutt, 1973; Jacob,1972; National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, 1974; and Vallance, 1971). Yet because each of these studies refers to only one segment of the broader human services field, there is still no vehicle for gaining a perspective of the existing education programs in all the areas considered to be human services professional education. The survey and analysis presented in this report is the first attempt to gain this perspective for human services education programs.

The difficulties accompanying such a task required that the purposes of this survey differ in many ways from other studies of training programs. First, there are no national lists or rosters identifying existing graduate programs carrying the title, *human services*. Second, there are no

accrediting bodies that certify human services training programs, per se. Third, there is no national professional organization representing all human services professionals as one identifiable entity.

Our purpose, then, was not to survey the education programs of any single helping profession or to survey the combination of helping professions sometimes called human service fields. Our intention was to examine the reports of those programs that identified with the term, human services, to determine their general nature and to generate some justifiable descriptive statements about the current state of human services education as it relates to the human services characteristics across community systems.

This background explains why the survey was not a formal research undertaking, but rather an effort to generate general descriptive data. We hope that the information from this survey and analysis will be a guide to future national developmental activities which may, in turn, lead to more refined conclusions about the nature of human services education.

Description of the Process

One assumption which we could informally test was our impression that chief academic officers of institutions of higher education tended not to have a clear notion of some of the more contemporary uses of the term, *human services*. It was for this reason that we addressed our first mailing of the Human Services Education Questionnaire to the chief academic officers of from two to ten universities in each State (a total of 152 requests). Appendix I includes a copy of the survey.

After waiting a period of one and a half months, a mailing was sent to human services program directors from each State. This list (of approximately 100) was developed over the last several years by Burnford, from an accumulation of systematic correspondence with human services educators whose programs had been described or listed in various publications or rosters. The list included program directors from the fields of mental health, health and hospital administration, public administration, social work, urban planning, human resources, gerontology, criminal justice, education, and other programs that grew out of some of these and other fields. The period between mailings allowed us to estimate, from responses, which returns had come as a result of each mailing.

Analysis of Information

Upon first examination of the questionnaire returns[2], it became apparent that most of the responses were from programs designed to train professionals for a particular professional field, such as social work, psychology, or public administration. For this reason, the response analysis could not be made by tabulating all returns within the same format. That is, a single summative figure for each item would have joined together responses describing different kinds of specialized programs rather than programs that could commonly be described as *human services*.

---

[2]Special assistance in the development of the questionnaire and tabulation was provided by the Office of Research and Development, College of Continuing Education, University of Southern California, Ernest Chioffi, Director, Richard Ridge, and Maissa Cochran, Research Assistants.

Questionnaire returns were therefore grouped according to professional discipline or field, and the responses were tabulated by grouping. While the total returns exceeded 130, the distribution of returns within groupings presented very small *n's* — too small to draw legitimate statistical inferences about the programs of any single professional grouping.

Analysis of the questionnaire returns was, therefore, a combination of item-by-item tabulations within groupings and a general *clinical* examination of responses intended to bring to light new insights to the nature of programs.

The Nature of Education Programs in Human Services

The multitude of definitions and connotations associated with the use of program terminology caused us to settle upon some arbitrary distinctions and classifications to ensure that the readers could interpret our report within a common language base.

Interdisciplinary is used in this monograph to refer to programs in which the major concentration or specialization, itself, contains content that incorporates and relates knowledge and skills of two or more academic *disciplines* in reasonably equal proportions.

Multidisciplinary is used to refer to programs in which the major concentration or specialization, itself, utilizes in its course requirements courses from two or more academic *disciplines.*

Unidisciplinary is used to refer to programs in which the major concentration or specialization, itself, is primarily composed of subject content and courses of a single academic *discipline.*

Academic field is used to refer to specific *academic fields* within or apart from an academic discipline, e.g., speech pathology, journalism, counselor education. In the case of human services fields, examples are community psychiatry, gerontology, urban and regional planning, or public administration.

We believe the words, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary, are inappropriate to describe human services fields or community systems and their academic counterparts. It is not only the root, discipline, which presents the problem; the prefixes are also inappropriate to describe the ideology and activities of the contemporary human services movement. Human services fields such as community development, criminal justice, or public administration are not combinations of many (multi) disciplines, nor links between (inter) disciplines.

For the clarification of future national dialogue and discussion of human services education issues, we offer the substitute roots of field and system (inter-field, intersystem, multi-field, multi-system) to replace *discipline;* and we suggest the prefix, *cross,* to suggest a more *human services* meaning, when it applies.

The word, *cross-fields,* is used to refer to programs in which the major concentration or specialization, itself, contains content that incorporates and relates knowledge and skills across more than two academic fields. (This content will, most likely, also reflect more than two basic disciplines.)

Programs that bring together (integrate) this content into *intra*-course content (more than a single integrative seminar) will be referred to as cross-fields programs. Programs that utilize

knowledge and skills from more than two academic fields, as separate courses (not *intra*-course integration), will be referred to as multi-field programs.

While there may be legitimate arguments against such limitations on the use of these terms, we feel the distinctions may be useful in order to differentiate among human services education programs.

The Term, Human Services, and Related Terms

Those who read the human services professional literature across fields will recognize the confusion surrounding the use of the term, *human services*. Definitions, implied definitions, and connotations differ considerably from field to field.

In the community , State, and Federal levels of human services delivery, the term *human services* is used to refer to such systems as health, mental health, children and family services, corrections, or public aid. Field practitioners consider human services to apply to a combination of helping systems; while in the university, those who use the term generally are referring to a single department or field — the field of their own expertise.

Thus, the faculty in a school of social work generally refer to human services as *their* field of expertise; while in the same university, the faculty of a psychology department, criminal justice institute, and urban studies department often have the same impression that human services is *their* field.

Human services is used by many to refer to an ideology or belief system (Baker, 1974) irrespective of its academic location or field setting. By others (Chenault, 1975), it is considered to be a national movement incorporating the above conditions, but also including other identifiable characteristics.

An examination of the responding programs (Appendix III), reveals the wide range of academic areas or fields reporting what they or their administrative superiors considered to be human services education programs. Most of the program titles are commonly understood to represent established disciplines or fields. However, some of terminology associated with program titles is not commonly understood, even among professionals. These titles use the word *human* as an adjective and tend to refer to different kinds of programs.

In an effort to clarify our own use of the terms and our classification of programs, we present the following general (and arbitrary) categories for those programs using the word *human* in their titles:

Human Development Programs and Human Relations Programs

These terms are generally used in graduate programs originating from schools of education, often in departments stressing counselor education. They are also used to describe undergraduate programs offering a major or concentration that includes considerable course work in the human sciences, especially education, psychology, and sociology.

Human Resources Programs

This terminology most often refers to manpower programs offered in departments or schools of business administration. The programs often originated and/or are maintained by U.S. Department of Labor funding.

Some schools of education who have broadened their purpose and scope are changing their school names to schools of human resources and education (e.g., West Virginia University), and their general focus is education rather than manpower.

Human Ecology Programs

Again, this title reflects somewhat more recent attempts to represent inter- and multidisciplinary programs or a broader perspective than is ordinarily represented by a single academic field (e.g., the School of Human Ecology of Cornell University).

Human Services Programs

When followed by the word, *administration,* human services programs are generally graduate programs, but the departments in which they are offered varies. Most often, these programs originate in schools of public health, departments of social work, public administration, and business administration.

When not followed by the word, *administration,* human services programs are generally undergraduate programs — associate degree or baccalaureate degrees. Some of these programs are sociology and one is corrections, but most represent "general" helping skills; they are for the purpose of training paraprofessionals for generalist positions. These latter programs, without exception in our survey, are a collection of courses from various academic departments or fields, such as education, psychology, and sociology.

Some of the more recently developed human services *graduate* programs also do not use the term, *administration,* in their titles (e.g., the University of North Carolina and Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville).

In universities, the field of education is often considered to be a part of the elective program of students in various human services programs; and in a few cases, the schools of education offer human services programs themselves. However, in the *field* at community, State, and Federal levels, educational institutions are generally not understood to be included in the definition of the term, *human services,* at least in an operational sense. (We may conjecture that the political and economic structure and special interests represented by education surely play an important part in its remaining outside the reorganizational considerations in the various States where reorganization is occurring.)

Human Services Education Questionnaire Responses

Role-centered and Field-centered Training Programs

An indication of the human services roles for which graduates are prepared can be determined by examining the job roles or functions and the fields or systems within which the roles are to be performed. Role-centered programs tend to be undisciplinary or profession-based (using a loose definition of profession). Examples of role-centered training programs are counseling, social work, community psychology, gerontology, and public administration. Field or system-centered programs are represented in criminal justice, mental health, public health, and hospital administration.

CURRENT STATE OF HUMAN SERVICES PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Item 19 of the Human Services Education Questionnaire was designed to provide a useful classification for analyzing the nature of professional education programs in human services. The following Figure presents that classification.

FIGURE 1

Symbol Classification for Role-centered and System-centered Training Programs in Human Services

Role/System Symbol	Purpose for which students are prepared
1-1	To perform a single specialized job role within a single field or system
1-x	To perform a specialized job role across fields or systems
x-1	To perform a number of job roles in a single field or system
x-x	To perform a number of job roles across fields or systems

Item 19 brought to light a number of programs that train personnel for employment in a single field for a single specialized job role (1-1), such as school counseling programs. Yet other programs falling within the 1-1 classification are quite representative of the human services movement in the community.

> Example: Western Michigan Specialist Program in Alcohol and Drug Abuse trains students as specialists in this area to "work within their professional discipline."

If we classify programs from the perspective of available options within a program, it can be seen that the Western Michigan program does not 'purely' fit the 1-1 classification. There is more than one professional discipline available which can be included as a programmatic base for the Alcohol and Drug Abuse specialization. We have used this example to show that our classification is based upon the job function or role which any single student is prepared to perform. However, it is possible that a further refinement of program analysis could include such additional program aspects as the discipline options for specializations.

The 1-x category responses suggest that students are prepared to work across fields (although sometimes only two), but in a single specialized job function; or a social worker, for example, might work in a hospital, mental health clinic, public aid or corrections setting. However, there are other interesting examples that may be classified 1-x:

> Example: The Human Services Design Laboratory at Case Western Reserve University reports the special focus upon the program evaluator as a specialist function.

Some programs prepare students to perform a number of job functions within a single field — a program characteristic that clearly identified either unidisciplinary or uni-field training but within a broad array of job roles (x-1).

Example: A number of functions in a specialist field is illustrated by the American College of Hospital Administration (Chicago), Health Care Administration being the field (x-1).

Some health administration programs train students for a specialist function (usually management), such as Xavier University's programs (1-1).

Very few program respondents indicated that students are prepared for multiple job functions across fields (x-x). Of those who did, the number of fields rarely exceeded two, and the job functions described clearly refer to roles that are identified with specific professions. One of the more 'pure' x-x classifications follows.

Example: The University of North Carolina lists the several job functions as policy management, planning, and evaluation; and the fields are listed as business, city and regional planning, education, health administration, social work, and public administration.

Responses to item 19 helped to establish the necessity of studying the *nature* of programs, if one is to determine what programs in human services really concern. *Relying upon program titles for descriptive information in human services education is completely misleading.*

Categorical Aspects of Specialization

We have said for a number of years that university education programs which prepare providers for human services must deal with the relationships between higher education and the characteristics of human services needs and delivery in the community. Toward that end, Chenault (1975) has contributed a classification of the categorical aspects of specialization in human services especially adapted for use in program development in institutions of higher education. We have used that classification as a vehicle for our analysis and discussion of human services education (Figure II).

FIGURE II

Levels of Categorical Specialization in Human Services

Levels	Primary Focus	Examples
Level I	A single client group associated with specialized problems	veterans, unemployed, widowed, hospitalized mental patients, welfare recipients, ex-offenders, battered partners, legal aid recipients
Level II	problems or needs associated with age level	early childhood education, juvenile delinquency, gerontology, adult education
Level III	an area of special problems or group of problems	alcohol & drug abuse (substance abuse), mental retardation, vocational rehabilitation, urban planning
Level IV	social institutions set up to address special problems or needs	social welfare, health, mental health, corrections, government, education, the ministry, employment and training
Level V	problems or needs addressed in their interrelationships among the above special service areas	Health Systems Agencies, State Departments of Human Services, U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, Type III human services education programs, community multiservice centers, Title XX of the Social Security Act

The many nuances and complexities in the delivery of services, as suggested by Figure II, make it unwise to rely on the classification for purposes other than a general reference for study and discussion. Many services cannot be placed 'purely' in a single Level; for example, juvenile delinquency and child abuse are both age- and problem-focused; children and family services cross age levels; career education is applicable to Level II but also crosses somewhat into Level I.

The results of the national survey indicate that it would be highly unusual for graduate degree programs to train personnel in Level V programs. This is true although various kinds of inservice and continuing education programs do offer short-term training in Level V problem areas.

For some kinds of Level IV programs (e.g., early childhood education), no questionnaires were received, which could be interpreted as an indication that these kinds of programs tend not to be regarded as "human services" programs. However, responses were spread rather evenly over Levels II, III, and IV, with the area of social work representing the highest number of responses. It would appear from this survey that Level I programs are quite rare.

One tendency of contemporary human services education programs is for changing the categorical nature of programs to follow the nature of services offered in the community; that is, to move *downward* in the Categorical Specialization Levels (e.g., mental retardation services are becoming incorporated in the broader developmental disabilities, adult education is moving toward lifelong learning, alcohol and drug abuse is moving toward substance abuse).

Specialization Content of Human Services Programs

We have selected three separate and simple classifications because, at this stage in the development of human services, we feel that a complicated matrix would not serve our purposes. These complex conditions provide a *message* to professionals concerning the overlapping and interrelationships that comprise human services.

Together these three classifications make it possible to differentiate among human services education programs, examining the nature of the programs from more than one perspective. The first classification (Service Roles) provided a basis for distinguishing both service roles and the single or multiple fields within which they may be performed. Specialization Levels in human services provided the second classification which offered a common referent for examining the categorical nature of education programs.

The third classification provides type distinctions[3] by which we can examine the specialization content of human services programs (Figure III). It can be seen that this classification incorporates the first two classifications with the nature of cross-fields specialization.

[3]There are some similarities between the descriptions of these program types of Cohen's (in press) Models I, II, and III, but the nature of the differences suggests that they should be regarded as two distinct kinds of classification for different purposes.

FIGURE III

Type Classification of Specialization Content in Human Services Programs

	Type I	Type II	Type III
Role/System Symbol	1-1 1-x or x-1	1-x x-1	x-x
Specialization Level	Level IV or Level V	Level II or Level III	Level I
Nature of Cross-fields Specialization	a) Multi-field content is provided primarily by other departments as a complement to the academic field or unit of the specialization. or b) Multi-field content is provided by the specialization to other academic fields or programs.	a) Multi-field content is part of the *core* or specialization portion of the total program. b) Multi-field content is designed for role-centered or system-centered training. c) Multi-field content is designed and offered by the specialization department or unit.	a) Cross-fields content is part of the *core* or specialization portion of the total program. b) Cross-fields content is specifically designed for non-"centered" training. c) Cross fields content is provided through more than 3 courses of the specialized core. d) Cross-fields content represents more than 3 human services fields.

The results of the national survey regarding this program dimension of specialization content followed the same trend as the role/system and specialization level classifications; that is, the large majority of programs were Type II, a number of programs were Type I, and only two could be classified as 'true' Type III programs.

Whether human services education programs will or should move toward Type III programs is a matter which has not yet stood the test of national professional dialogue and experience. This issue, along with many others, was the subject of task force deliberations at the national conference described in Part II.

Even if we restrict our focus to Type II programs only, there is still too wide a diversity among programs for generalizations to be made with confidence. While the rapidly changing human services environment at local, State, and Federal levels and the early developmental stages of so many programs may be said to account for much of the diversity, there is more reason to believe that such diversity is primarily a function of the categorical level of the various programs. To say it another way, one cannot place so many different kinds of professional programs within the same classification (human services) and expect to find commonalities except at a very general level. Evidence of program diversity is also illustrated by the range of pre-

paration time required for professional training — from short, single continuing education or in-service education workshops without Continuing Education Units or credit, to 3-year doctoral degree programs.

Human Services Program Curricula

The following general conclusions can be drawn from the combination of responses relating to curriculum:

1. In degree programs, the requirements for specialization content range from one course plus practicum to eight courses in the core specialization.
2. The *core* of essential knowledge (required courses in the specialization) tends to be either unidisciplinary or uni-field.
3. Curriculum of programs appears to be in most cases a selected list of existing courses with an additional course or two whose title bears the name of the specialization.
4. As one would expect, the subject content of the required specialization courses is consistently and clearly the subject content of the departmental field within which the specialization is offered. That is, a mental health specialization offered in a Department of Public Administration, the content tends to be 'public administration-type' content. (There were several exceptions to this general rule.)
5. With rare exceptions, practicum or field experience is a separate curricular part of the program, coming at or near the end of the student's program.
6. Very few programs prepare human services *generalists* at the graduate level, and even those which reported that they do, appear to mean by generalist training that students are trained for more than one role specialization (x-1).
7. Participation of the community in curriculum planning, when it exists at all, seems to amount to soliciting letters of support from human service organization administrators for program proposals developed solely by university faculty. (The University of Maine program is a notable exception.)
8. New programs tend not to be new curricula except in the adding of one or two new courses to already-existing program content. That is, new programs are almost always evolutionary adaptations of existing programs. New program titles generally cover the same programs in slight rearrangements.

Economic Support of Programs by Their Institutions

The range of financial support for human services programs was from zero to over $400,000 for faculty salaries and from zero to over $100,000 for budget lines other than salaries. This range does not seem so startling when one considers the wide variety of programs reported. That is, there was a range of programs from small intradepartmental programs having one assigned faculty person less than full time to large school-level programs involving a number of departments. It is ironic to note that some programs having the highest economic support cite as their primary problem the lack of economic support; whereas some programs of equal size which have no assigned budget, do not consider this a major problem.

One simple illustration suggests some interesting issues for discussion at the national level by university educators and administrators and at the Federal level by government administrators. The Rehabilitation Counselor Training Program at one university in the Middle West has an assigned budget, not including faculty salaries, of between $50,000 and $75,000, 65 percent of which is university monies. This program is in its developmental stage and graduated 16 stu-

dents last year. A second Middle Western university graduated 85 students in human services its last year of operation, but the assigned program budget, not including faculty salaries, was zero.

This example suggests the wide divergence among administrators in higher education with respect to the relative importance of human services programs within the total organization. It can be said that institutional commitment to economic support of human services programs is largely restricted to already existing and rather highly specialized programs. For recently instituted programs, support tends to be in the nature of re-assignment of faculty (almost always *within* departments) and 'bootlegging' existing resources. Many program respondents reported there were no support dollars from their institutions for new programs and new programs were impossible without external funding or hard-to-get new State monies.

It is not unreasonable to conclude, on the basis of the reponses, that universities either do not know how or are unwilling to reallocate existing resources to support new human service program development. It appears to us that higher education in general has not dealt with the forceful relationships between organizational territoriality and the new economic constraints facing it.

Problems and Needs

The Human Services Education Questionnaire addresses perceived program problems in Item 52. It can be said most programs considered their major problems to fall in the general areas of economic need, inadequate administrative leadership, and faculty negativism. The particular items checked most often were:

- lack of economic support
- lack of faculty interest outside your own department or unit
- general faculty resistance
- general suspicion of a passing fad
- administrators' lack of knowledge about subject area of program
- lack of administrative leadership above program level

The fields of social work and nursing stood out as having more concerns about such problem areas as inadequate preparation of entering students, supervision of field assignments, and assessment of field learning.

The Vallance report (1971) includes special attention not only to problems encountered by the interdisciplinary units studied but also to recommendations for dealing with these problems. While Vallance surveyed 45 responding organizations from a select list of largely interdisciplinary programs, there are a number of similarities in problem areas. For example, territoriality was the most frequently mentioned problem in his study, a result resembling written comments in our survey with respect to those programs that were most innovative in their content. One of his respondents reported that his unit, "encountered a storm of opposition from several existing departments who felt that if an interdepartmental unit were to be established it should deal with problems in their area which they considered to be of greater scientific importance than the study of (this unit's thing). There was jealousy over appointive power and fear that this unit would drain funds that might have become available to departmental programs."

Vallance cites a Robert Ardrey comment that is especially relevant for the future development of human services programs:

> When I wrote *The Territorial Imperative*, my object was to establish the territorial principle as biologists have observed and defined it, relating to an exclusive area of defended space. I indulged in few speculations concerning the application of the principle to areas less tangible than real estate. Every such speculation, I judged, would weaken the rigor of biology's conclusions. Yet it was obvious that with the conceptual capacities of the human mind the imperative to defend a territory has been extended far beyond fence posts and locked doors. Jobs, departments in an organization, jurisdictions of labor unions, spheres of influence whether in politics or crime are as jealously guarded as a warbler's acre. When I first suggested the subject of my book to C.R. Carpenter, he was amused: "Why bother with animals? Why not just visit Pennsylvania State University for a few weeks and keep an eye on the faculty?"

Innovations

Since it would not be feasible to list all the perceived innovative features of human services programs. we include a representative sample from our survey:

- Major focus upon organizational change
- Combines clincial and administrative skills
- Uses team teaching
- Subject matter focuses upon prevention
- Experiential learning
- Emphasis upon planned change processes
- An action research model of training

Innovations listed by respondents appear to be quite traditional, even old-fashioned, rather than innovative to those who work in the community and read the professional human services literature. But the rare instances of these *innovative* conditions in university programs in general, attests to their unusual nature. Vallance puts it succinctly:

> To people who think of themselves as veterans in the business of being interdisciplinary or of conducting applied social research, many of these claimed innovations may seem "old hat". To others, and clearly to many of the respondents in the survey, the actions are distinctly new in their settings, and, as will be seen later, their novelty is often validated by the defensive responses of many previously established parts of the parent institution.

Program Areas or Fields

We have selected five program areas for general discussion: mental health administration, community psychology, urban and regional planning, continuing education, and *human services* as a specialist/generalist field. As it was indicated earlier, there are a number of studies and reports that more than adequately paint the picture of such professional fields as social work, medicine, public administration, education, and others.

The first four areas selected, with the possible exception of community psychology, tend not to represent a single profession and in their general directions tend to illustrate the contemporary human services movement with regard to such dimensions as the movement away from categorical services toward the integration and coordination of services. Another way of describing these criteria for selection is to consider the programs as representative of those Type II programs that lean away from profession-centered, role-centered, and field-centered programs.

The fifth area, human services programs, represents those that are closet to Type III programs. Because these programs are most recent and most rare, we have devoted a separate section to that area.

Community Psychology Programs

Community psychology programs described in questionnaire returns and in university catalogs confirm the conclusion that they tend to represent Type II Human Services Programs — clearly unidisciplinary, but unlike Type I programs in the sense that their interest and focus is upon applying one's expertise in psychology to "community" problems and services.

To our knowledge, there is no community psychology program that does not operate as a part of a psychology department. In those departments where community psychology is a priority, it is offered as an option among other psychology specializations. An example would be the specialty offerings at Vanderbilt, where the Psychology Department offers options in clinical, psychotherapy, psychopharmacology, and community psychology.

The Systems and Community Psychology Program at West Virginia University provides a special emphasis upon systems, as indicated by the requirements common to all students: Introduction to Systems Analysis, Systems Seminars, Computer Science or Public Administration, Systems Practicum, Dissertation, and a 6-month's internship. Under this general program, options for specialization are: human services administration, mental health administration, educational systems administration, program evaluation, or developmental disabilities administration. While this program appears still to have a strong unidisciplinary (psychology) base, it nevertheless represents somewhat more *generalist* training than other community psychology programs with which we are familiar.

A Community Psychology Institute is sponsored by the Psychology Department at the University of Cincinnati. It has recently changed its organization development orientation and reactive funding approach to focus now upon research, training, and then service. A new thematic focus permits consideration of profit organizations. These thematic areas are: problems of urban living, life transitions, and the organization of human services.

The goal of the problems of urban living theme is: to develop and evaluate intervention methods which improve relationships between individuals and their environments, to design and evaluate new social systems, and to enhance the psycho-social opportunities for residents in urban areas. The life transitions theme refers to a human development focus (entering school, choosing a career, getting married, becoming a patient, retiring, etc.). The Institute's strategy in this area is to develop a service or research program in one or more transition areas and develop the market for its application.

The third thematic area, the organization of human services, may be accomplished by one or more of the following operating modes: a) respond to calls from potential clients and negotiate individual service contracts with appropriate assessment (allowing the Institute to test the

general applicability of its theory and technology); b) concentrate on some particular set of issues or problems, obtaining external funding for research and development and finding client systems with whom to work; c) collect and assess existing work in the field and produce bibliographies and critical reviews; d) concentrate on a set of services and study them in depth; and e) concentrate on the evaluation of organizational interventions in order to increase a data file and to observe a variety of interventions.

The Jacobs study (1972) of graduate education in community psychology provides important information related to the present study. Jacobs found that 12 psychology departments of the 59 respondents offered a formal subprogram in community psychology and 6 other departments indicated "informal" programs, or were currently in the process of planning a formal subprogram. It is reasonable to expect that since that survey, this number has increased.

Some assumptions about the nature of psychology programs responding to the Jacobs survey can be made on the basis of information supplied:

1. Only 19 departments reported training experiences in the area of prevention during the last three years before the survey.
2. Only 8 departments offered training experiences in mental health education.
3. Formal course offerings in community psychology infrequently extend beyond an introductory course presenting a general overview of the field and perhaps an additional course related to a particular intervention strategy or content area.
4. The relative absence of extensive course sequences appeared to be less a function of insufficient content and more related to such problems as availability of competent faculty to teach such courses and to curriculum overload.

Jacobs drew the following general conclusions:

> To extent that community psychology's goals include the prevention of emotional disorders and the promotion of mental health . . . the relative infrequency of these types of activities appears to be a significant shortcoming in current practicum training experiences. In addition, relatively little involvement has occurred within such settings as churches, universities, Office of Economic Opportunity programs, and judicial and correctional institutions, and few departments have offered any of the community psychology activities, except consultation, in two or more different settings . . . a) most students are exposed to various community psychology activities, b) they do not become intensively involved with such activities, and c) such involvements generally account for a relatively small proportion of the students' total practicum experiences.

Mental Health Programs

Virtually all graduate mental health programs are mental health *administration* and are offered as a specialization within MPH (masters in public health) and MSW (masters in social work) degree programs. Some mental health programs are offered in departments or schools of public administration, business administration, or the equivalent; some are offered in schools of medicine; and a few are joint programs combining two of the above areas.

While the area from which mental health programs originate seems to flavor the nature of the programs, in many cases the specialized course requirements reflect an added discipline or field more than the field of the organizational home. For the most part, the added field is ad-

ministration or management. Thus, the MSW programs tend to train social workers for work in mental health systems with an emphasis upon administration of programs; and the same is true for the MPH except that students are trained as public health workers.

Course requirements in the mental health specializations reflect the major differences among MSW and MPH programs:

MSW Program Examples (excluding social work foundations)

Florida State University:

organizational behavior
evaluative research
policy analysis
planning and administration
integrative seminar

Indiana University:

planning process in social welfare
administration of manpower resources in social welfare systems
financial management of social welfare organizations
seminar in social policy
social policy in the legislative process
research seminars

Ohio State University:

changes in human services organization
community mental health
executive and middle-management roles in human service organizations
human service administration
seminar on the application of experimental design to evaluation in social work research
social planning for social service delivery in the public sector

Washington University (St. Louis):

organization theory and analysis
administrative or management practice
monitoring and evaluating organizational performance
organizational research and statistics
social planning and policy analysis

MPH Program Example (excluding public health foundations)

Columbia University:

principles and practice of community psychiatry and mental health
social science concepts and consultation
socio-cultural factors in the presence of community psychiatry
mental health administration
psychodynamics

Johns Hopkins University:

organization
group dynamics
alcoholism
maternal-infant behavior
drug abuse
planning
operations research
behavioral sciences

University of Minnesota:

management
personnel
organizational behavior
financial management
problem solving
legal aspects
clinicians
dehumanization

It can be seen that mental health administration programs tend to lean heavily upon the *business* of administration. One can speculate that this is because mental health programs grew up at a time when mental health administration was seen as the application of skills from a second discipline or field (mental health) to the *major* discipline (e.g., social work, public health). As the previous examples illustrate, generally the specialization of mental health refers to one or two courses in mental health and the specialization of administration carries the weight in specialized courses.

A second possible influence upon the development of mental health programs is the necessity of schools of social work and public health to utilize already existing courses which are often the *territory* of departments of business administration, public administration, and others. This results in the putting together of categorical parts.

Thus, for the most part, mental health programs are primarily social work programs (or public health programs) with a specialization in administration and a few courses in mental health. It should be said that the field experience associated with these programs is clearly a mental health practicum.

George Washington University, Northern Illinois University, and New York University are examples of programs offered in public administration, business administration, or the equivalent

— the latter program being a doctoral program in Public Administration and Mental Health Policy and Administration.

One of the few jointly sponsored mental health programs is offered by the University of Minnesota School of Public Health and Department of Psychiatry of the Medical School. The degree offered is the MHA (Masters in Health Administration).

The combination of programs at Columbia University illustrates how a number of programs within the same institution have developed in the area of mental health administration. In the Division of Community and Social Psychiatry (School of Public Health) three programs are offered in conjunction with the Department of Psychiatry:

Master of Science Program in Administrative Medicine (preparing personnel to work in the delivery of comprehensive community mental health services)
Master of Science Program in Community and Social Psychiatry (psychiatric residencies and mid-career programs for leaders in the administration of mental health programs)
Master of Public Health, Mental Health Administration Training, Community Mental Health Program (preparing baccalaureate graduates for leadership roles in mental health programs)

A fourth Mental Health Administration Training Program offers the MSW or DSW from the School of Social Work.

For a number of years, Harvard Medical School's Laboratory of Community Psychiatry (LOCP) offered a postdoctoral program in community mental health for practitioners in a number of human service systems. The influence of the LOCP can be seen in the development and/or revision of a number of university education programs, as well as in a wide range of public leadership roles at the national, State, and local levels.

Urban and Regional Planning Programs

Urban and Regional Planning Programs are often more concerned with research aspects than are Type III programs. They stress the conducting of applied research on urban problems. The nature of program options helps to illustrate differences among urban and regional planning programs. The following universities reflect these differences in the program options listed:

University of Michigan

environmental analysis and design
quantitative methods (required)
social group processes
urban and regional economics
government and institutional processes

University of Tulsa

administration
community development
policy analysis

University of Houston

housing
health care delivery
urban finance
administration of human resources
transportation
urban and regional change

University of Cincinnati

major learning emphases:
urban planning
planned change
community organization
planned community change synthesis

The University of Cincinnati offers a Masters of Community Planning. This program reflects some of the more contemporary changes in this field. The first hint of this is in its use of the word, community, in its title. The program stresses change agent planning with a focus upon the planning process. Its philosophy is highly plural, entailing many counterperspectives; and the organizational climate is described as one of structured behavior, including debate, multiple viewpoints, and "vigorous interaction among strongminded people, as students and faculty refuse to accept easy or simplistic solutions to today's urban crises."

"The program seeks to create an interdisciplinary learning community where students and faculty participate jointly in community and human resource educational development." Following are additional aspects of the program according to its questionnaire report:

1. Emphasis is upon developing planned change process skills for achieving client-determined goals and objectives within the context of the urban human service environment.
2. Students are introduced to all phases of community planning.
3. The core knowledge consists of four major learning emphases central to the education of change agent personnel (see above list).
4. Each student is required to select a collateral functional field of specialization (e.g., education, health, manpower, criminal justice.)

Some of the program development problems encountered by respondents in our study initiation of urban and regional planning programs include the following:

1. Independent budgeting of an interdepartmental, inter-college unit;
2. Faculty arguments concerning the relative importance of each of the disciplinary areas;
3. Both core courses and specialty area courses are taught by faculty from other departments;
4. Lack of clear understanding by faculty and administration of goals of the program;
5. Insufficient number of faculty;

6. Difficulty of resolving problems created by joint appointments, especially non-tenured faculty;
7. Need for a reasonable reward system;
8. Difficulty of obtaining 'hard' money support;
9. Difficulty in gaining university acceptance.

Denbow and Nutt (1973) surveyed graduate planning programs in an effort to keep up-to-date with planning education in a rapidly changing field. The authors found an increasing proportion of minority planning students, greater student participation in departmental decisionmaking, few women or minority planning faculty members, limited resourcefulness in amount or mode of financial aid, and few schools with well-articulated curricula. Suggestions by the authors for future change included the need for collaborative *synoptic* efforts undertaken by planning education programs and the planning profession, and the need for programs to utilize the Consultation and Recognition Program for Planning Education (AIP) process as a possible basis.

Some additional conclusions of the Denbow-Nutt study are negative and plainspoken:

1. There is great uncertainty on the part of planning department about planning education and the nature of its component elements.
2. It seems . . . likely that the profession and its educational practitioners just are not sure what it is they are or ought to be doing educationally (Mann, 1972).
3. The assumptions and approaches that worked in the past no longer meet the challenges of present student constituencies.
4. The relatively unchanging character of faculties coupled with the apparent distancing of planning schools and faculties from professional planning practice provide significant barriers to accomplishing the changes needed to achieve coherent planning programs.
5. The constantly evolving nature of planning practice itself provides few particularly useful directions for planning education.
6. All protestations to the contrary, the professional planning organizations (and their memberships) have been of limited help to planning schools in their curricular quandaries.
7. The attraction of planning departments to more traditional academic disciplines, notably the social sciences, is an enticement that even further confuses the planning education scene.
8. The new Consultation and Recognition Program for Planning Education (AIP) . . . intended to be a collaborative effort of planning education programs and the planning profession, in effect brings the planning process into planning education.

Continuing Education

A number of programs reported are *formal* continuing education programs, in the sense that they are offered by units of the university entitled Continuing Education. Some reported are in the nature of continuing education but are offered directly by the department offering the degree certificate, or CEU (continuing education unit.)

The Human Resources Institute at the State University of New York at Buffalo illustrates such a program. HRI is a SUNYAB-wide interfaculty curriculum development and teaching unit operating under a U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Institutional Grant. The Institute offers various educational programs in the human resources development area for both students and practitioners throughout the DOL Region II geographical district.

The Certification Program in Manpower Administration consists of eight 1-week units scheduled over a 2-year period. Upon completion of the eight units, participants receive a certificate issued by the School of Management at SUNY-Buffalo, and jointly recognized by the State University of New York and Rutgers State University of New Jersey. In addition, SUNYAB awards graduates 24 CEU's.

A third kind of continuing education program is the Joint Center for Human Services Development at San Jose State University. The Center is totally supported by Federal contracts and grants and provides experientially based learning as well as an action-research model of training. Emphasis is upon planned change processes.

The Human Services Design Laboratory of Case Western Reserve is an interdisciplinary center engaged in developing new ways to apply social science and management science technologies to problems of policy formation, program design, and coordination and evaluation of human service programs. The Laboratory extends assistance to locations in Ohio and throughout the Middle West. As stated in its brochure, the objectives are:

- to provide technical assistance and applied research to human service organizations in problems relating to program design, service delivery, policy formation, management coordination, and program evaluation;
- to provide training for graduate students of the School of Applied Social Sciences of Case Western Reserve;
- to provide opportunities for faculty of the School of Applied Social Sciences to conduct research and engage in technical assistance in their fields of expertise.

The Human Services Center, College of Continuing Education, University of Southern California, has played a leadership role in the establishment of a national network of human service practitioners and academicians. This center also offers both credit and non-credit courses to Human Services professionals and paraprofessionals.

In some universities and colleges when the human services and higher education "movement" is experiencing difficulty locating a "home", Continuing Education may offer a very necessary neutral forum which does not exclusively represent any one of the many professional disciplines which are part of the human services movement.

McKenzie (in press) has stated, "The human service disciplines are practicing disciplines. Human service theories are applied to public policy directly and continually with each new or revised government program and attendent regulations. Gaps between theory, policy and practice tend to surface quickly, and resolution of problems simply cannot be left to a laborious 'trickle-down' system of scholarly research to classroom and textbook presentation to new scholars and practitioners to field experience and research. Continuing Education activities both within and across existing disciplinary lines, are logical feedback and exchange systems for simultaneous access by theorists, policy makers, and practitioners." The nature of human service activities demand that academicians, practitioners, government officials, and recipients be brought together in ways that promote two-way conversations among all involved. Continuing Education at its best, is uniquely suited to provide a forum for such interactions.

Organizational Arrangements

The organizational homes of the programs described in the Human Services Education Questionnaire returns represent a wide range, including autonomous units reporting directly to the university president, institutes, centers, colleges, schools, departments, options or specializations within departments, certificate programs associated with existing professional degree programs, and non-credit continuing education programs.

Some universities have "umbrella" organizational structures housing a number of programs that could be called human services. The broadest of these (about which we received information) is the University of Cincinnati's College of Community Service. It includes undergraduate programs in Community Health Planning/Administration, Criminal Justice, Social Work, and Urban Affairs; and graduate programs in Community Health Planning/Administration, Criminal Justice, Rehabilitation Counseling, and Social Work.

Some schools or colleges within universities have a broad range of programs making their offerings *human services* in nature; but they differ from the umbrella structures in a number of ways, particularly in their need to be restricted to programs that fall only under the discipline of the school.

The School of Public Health at the University of Hawaii at Manoa is an example of one of the broader human services organizational arrangements. In addition to the programs it offers in Public Health Sciences (Biostatistics, Environmental Health, Epidemiology, Public Health Lab, Public Health Nutrition), it also offers programs in International Health, Special Programs, such as a residency program for physicians in General Preventive Medicine, and — through the Department of Community Health Development — programs in Gerontology, Health Services Adminstration/Planning, Maternal and Child Health, Mental Health, and Public Health Education.

It can be seen that the University of Hawaii program represents a uni-field (public health) home for a wide variety of programs, whereas the University of Cincinnati example illustrates the umbrella home for a wide variety of programs that fall under more than one discipline or field.

The University of Washington Graduate School of Public Administration provides for special options tailored to individual interests (e.g., labor relations, legislative administration, marine affairs) and a series of Public Policy Options (Social Policy Analysis, Resources and Environmental Policy, Urban Policy, Law and Justice, and Foreign Affairs).

Graduate programs in Cornell's Department of Community Service Education are Social Program Planning and Develcpment, Social Program Evaluation, and Higher Education in the Human Services. While these programs do not appear, at first glance, to have the breadth of other programs listing five to ten programs or specializations, the subject matter impiied by the terminology, *social programs* is, of course, quite broad.

The names of some organizational units express an effort to reach out toward broader concerns and perspectives. The College of Social Professions of the University of Kentucky illustrates this change. However, as we have said in other writing and will repeat to emphasize the point, it is important to examine course titles, syllabi, and other information in order to determine what is meant by and delivered under such broad-sounding titles.

For example, the University of Kentucky College of Social Professions, while adding subject areas such as corrections, health services, children and youth, and aged, is nevertheless a *social work* program: social work *in* corrections, and health service social work *with* children and aged. This is quite different from what could be construed by looking at the name.

In examining the nature of human services programs, we have to look for different kinds of distinguishing characteristics. Consider, for example, the differences among the following kinds of programs: a corrections program that has elements of social work, as it relates to corrections, in its curriculum; a social work program having elements of corrections, as it relates to social work, in its curriculum; a human services administration program that includes both corrections and social work elements in its curriculum (as they relate to the administration of programs); and a human services program that includes these three areas and more as they relate to one another.

The concept of studying a number of human services-related elements as they relate to one another is a totally different concept from studying them as they relate to a specific profession-based perspective. It is this interrelational concept (Chenault, 1975) which presents an important issue for human services educators to consider, for virtually all human services programs now follow the first assumption (the profession or field-based perspective).

Human Services As a Special Field

One of the final questionnaire items was the question: Do you believe there should be a special field or discipline called human services? There were generally more negative responses to this question, with the exception of education programs in general. There were no positive responses from programs in the following fields: public administration/business administration, community psychology, social work, health care administration, or clinical psychology.

Summary

The results of this national survey provide evidence of the wide diversity existing with respect to the meaning of human services education, as reflected by the range and kinds of graduate education programs. Many of the programs responding were Type I *categorical* programs — any multi-field content is provided primarily by departments outside the specialization. The majority of programs fell in the Type II category, indicating a role-centered or field-centered focus within less categorical human services fields.

Type III human services graduate education programs are extremely rare; only two such programs responded to the survey.

It is interesting to note that there were no responses from programs preparing professionals for the ministry, law, architecture, medicine, or the humanities. A number of chief academic officers of universities indicated their belief their entire education programs were *human services* and consequently did not complete a questionnaire.

PART IV: ILLUSTRATIVE HUMAN SERVICES GRADUATE PROGRAMS

As we have said a number of times, our classification system for human services programs should really not be used except for a very general differentiation for purposes of initial study and discussion. Having made that disclaimer, we have selected a few human services programs which seem to approach Type III programs, to present the reader with some examples of the diversity of programs. There are, of course, a number of other programs in the country which we have not included, for we felt that single examples of various kinds of programs would best serve our purpose.

The reader will notice that only two of these examples are "pure" Type III programs; however, each one illustrates Type III characteristics in one or more dimensions of its program.

George Peabody College for Teachers
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT LIAISON SPECIALIST PROGRAM

The primary goal of this program is to train individuals at the M.S. and Ed.S. levels to function as ecological intervention agents in existing human service and community education programs. The problems of individuals are viewed as a social/ecological matter, as opposed to intrapsychic processes or broad sociological processes. The social systems orientation is focused on: 1) the functional adequacy of the total ecological system of which the individual is a part, and 2) the program of ecological intervention strategies collaboratively planned and implemented by the members of the ecological system.

Selection of trainees is determined in part by their previous experience in human services, particularly in school systems. Other delivery systems include mental health centers, guidance clinics, courts, correctional facilities, residential treatment centers, child advocacy programs and the like.

Students are prepared as experts in the liaison process. This includes development in the knowledge of human behavior with interpretive skills, articulation and communication

processes, systems assessment and analysis skills, group work skills, consultation skills, community development skills, divergent and convergent thinking strategies, recording skills and self-awareness.

A program assumption that persons learn most effectively by the integration of theory with the actual work experience is stressed. Therefore, emphasis is on, "a combination of didactic and field-based experiences for each selected trainee with the program of studies geared to the person's individual needs, learning modes, and professional competencies and styles."

University of California at Davis
M.S. IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

This program provides an applied social science program of study and research in the field of community development. The principle focus of the program is on non-metropolitan areas and small towns. Emphasis is upon interrelations of groups and/or classes with the economy, education, culture, political progress, or problems in community settings.

Persons are prepared for professional roles in nonprofit and public organizations and as administrators, planners, and/or technicians in human services programs. The program emphasizes an understanding of the economic, social, and political changes required within a community to increase the community's potential for development.

Three course areas of concentration are offered:

Community Economic and Social Development:
for persons interested in social and economic development activities, planning, and evaluation in regional or local governments.

Community Program Administration and Management:
for persons interested in professional roles as administrators or technicians in local government or organizations responsible for the delivery of human services.

Community Organization and Development:
for persons interested in the community relations work within social welfare agencies, school districts, community colleges, and civic action groups.

Graduates from this program are expected to possess the skills to:

a) diagnose community problems and translate these diagnoses into projects and/or programs;
b) organize, administer, and direct community development programs;
c) be sensitive to community residents' needs and value systems; and
d) develop behaviors helpful in acting as change agents in community settings.

PART IV: ILLUSTRATIVE HUMAN SERVICES GRADUATE PROGRAMS

State University College at Brockport (New York)
HUMAN ENVIRONMENTS AND SERVICES PLANNING PROGRAM

The bachelors and masters programs are highly integrated in terms of content, philosophy, and faculty, making the transition from the baccalaureate to the masters component a natural proposition. The undergraduate component provides an initial competence adequate for professional practice under supervision of a fully qualified professional planner. The masters component provides an advanced level of competence adequate for independent practice as a professional planner.

The program has three major objectives. First, it combines in one program the essential curricular content from separate programs of professional education in: a) urban and regional planning, b) comprehensive health planning, and c) social welfare planning.

Second, it provides personnel at two levels of competency to meet the expanding needs of planning organizations. And third, it reduces the total time required for professional education in planning from six to five years.

Because of the integrated relationship of the undergraduate and graduate components, persons completing the baccalaureate will be the primary group for selection into the masters component. Others who have completed a baccalaureate in another field are required to develop an individualized course of study meeting the requirements of the masters degree component.

The four major objectives of the masters component are:

a) The development of a capacity to understand and apply complex technical methods for the collection, analysis, and interpretation of information and data in various planning contexts.
b) The development of a capacity to analyze and interpret the visable and latent involvement of individuals and organizations in different planning contexts.
c) The development of an integrated understanding of the relationships between environmental and service system planning functions.
d) The development of sophisticated professional use of human relations expertise to facilitate planning processes.

Required courses include the following:

Planning Problem Analysis: Information and Data
Analysis of Human Relations Factors in Planning Problems
Technical Methods in Creative Problem Solving
Involvement Methods in Creative Problem Solving
Practicums in Neighborhood, Community, and Regional Planning
Internships, Seminars, and Electives

The George Washington University
INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) seeks to strengthen present and potential leadership in American education at the policy level of State and Federal government. IEL

is a policy planning and coordinating agency for a number of related educational programs listed below. Each of the programs assists policymakers to improve communications with educators and other affected constituencies in the belief that better information and mutual trust are key ingredients in effective public policymaking. Currently, IEL programs are making a concerted effort to strengthen the intergovernmental system in education by creating new forums for the interchange of ideas among Federal, State, and local education policymakers.

Education Policy Fellowship Program

A national program designed to help provide future leaders with the skills in policymaking they must have to exert effective and enlightened leadership in American education.

Educational Staff Seminars (ESS)

A professional development program designed for staff members employed by the Executive and Legislative Branches of the Federal government in the field of education. The goal of ESS is to provide an open forum in which participants can improve their professional capabilities and personal fulfillment on the job by:

a) being exposed to new ideas and perspectives;
b) increasing their knowledge of particular subjects and their understanding of how programs actually operate in the field; and
c) meeting with other professionals involved in the legislative and policy formulation processes in an informal learning environment which fosters improved professional leaderships.

The Associates Program (TAP)

An evolving IEL activity which provides seminars and other forums for legislators and other policymakers at State capitals. Other TAP efforts are:

a) maintaining a network of statelevel generalists whose ties to IEL in the nation's capital provide linkages among federal and state education policymakers;
b) encouraging similar linkages among agencies and coalitions seeking to improve processes of state-level decisionmaking; and
c) convening and co-sponsoring national or multi-state conferences dealing with state-level policy issues.

Postsecondary Education Convening Authority (PECA)

PECA brings together in a neutral forum, policymakers and practitioners to facilitate more informed decisionmaking around the issues of institutional licensing, consumer protection, state financing, and lifelong learning.

Options in Education

This program conducts a weekly radio series which has earned a reputation for no-nonsense, jargon-free reporting on current education issues.

PART IV: ILLUSTRATIVE HUMAN SERVICES GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Career Education Policy Project (CEPP)

CEPP addresses the issues of education, work, and society. It informs both policymakers and the public of the issues in and potential of the career education movement.

Project on Compensatory Education (PCE)

This program analyzes the governance of major federal and state compensatory education projects.

Family Impact Seminar (FIS)

FIS seeks to identify and assess the effects on families and children of a variety of public policies.

Washington Policy Seminar (WPS)

The Washington Policy Seminar brings groups of state educators and policymakers to the Capital for three to five days of intensive exposure to the people, processes, and institutions which shape Federal education policy.

The College for Human Services (New York)
MASTERS PROGRAM IN HUMAN SERVICES

The College for Human Services has designed a graduate program with the aim of having citizens take back their power in society by helping them to become better able to solve their own problems and to manage their lives. In short, to become free and creative people.

In shaping this program, the College has developed the analogy of crystals and prisms to suggest how it helps students draw on every source of learning, including theoretical materials and the arts, as well as their own experience in the field. The crystal represents a sequential unit of focused study. The prism describes the shape of the entire program.

Eight essential modes (or crystals) of providing service to empower citizens are suggested by the program:

1) Assume responsibility for lifelong learning;
2) Develop professional relationships with citizens and coworkers;
3) Work with others in groups;
4) Function as a teacher;
5) Function as a counselor;
6) Function as a community liaison;
7) Function as a supervisor; and,
8) Act as a change agent.

The interplay of these modes with the constant dimensions of purpose, values (self and others), systems, and skills creates the performance prism. The prism gives form then to the program that is totally directed to the needs and concerns of citizens. Learning is focused around constructive actions which students perform for and with the citizens they work with in the field. Theoretical material is organized for relevance to real performance issues with the final stage of planning being the week-to-week integration of classroom studies and field experience.

Cornell University
THE GRADUATE FIELD OF HUMAN SERVICES STUDIES

This program offers concentrations in the design and development of human services, in the evaluation of social programs, and in the preparation for teaching human service professions. Students enrolled for graduate degrees in this program are expected to have already had professional training and experience in an agency providing direct services to people. Graduates are working in Federal, State, regional, and local agencies as executives, program planners, evaluators, policy and budget analysts, and as university faculty in professional education programs.

The research and public service programs engaged in by faculty and students include such projects as:

- A policy-options and program design study of the Supplemental Security Income Program for the Office of the Governor of New York;
- An evaluation of the social planning processes of each of the fifty States, for HEW;
- An evaluation of the Extended Food and Nutrition Education Program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture;
- An evaluation of a family day-care resource program for the Carnegie Corporation;
- A study of the long-term effects of preschool education for the Education Commission of the States; and,
- A study of the use of needs-assessment data in local decision-making processes.

Additionally, field members — faculty and students — are heavily engaged in programs of continuing education for practicing professionals and staff in public agencies. In 1977 these programs included inservice training in 11 County Departments of Social Service, for teachers of home economics, vocational education teachers, and county extension agents. Currently under development are programs for the training of mental hospital personnel and a program to help local agencies develop self-evaluation skills.

Graduate work at Cornell is organized around common-interest fields, rather than departments or colleges, and field members may come from any department or unit of the univer-

sity. The Graduate Field of Human Services has no fixed courses or credit requirements for a graduate degree. Students select a committee of faculty and follow individualized programs, based on both the students' goals and background. The programs often consist of a combination of courses from any appropriate source, independent study and research, participation in ongoing research, educational and public service programs, and field experiences.

University of Maine at Portland-Gorham
HUMAN SERVICES SYSTEMS LEADERSHIP MASTERS PROGRAM

At the beginning of the academic year, 1977-1978, this Advanced Study program is expected to be inaugurated under the College of Education in conjunction with the Educational Administration degree. The program evolved from a Plan for Graduate Education in the Human Services. devised by a university task force consisting of both university and agency representatives.

The Advanced Study Program will be aimed at improving human services systems, and will offer academic programming to currently employed and potential human services leaders. Emphasis will be placed on the knowledge, skills, and tools needed to perform better on the job as policy analysts and administrators. The academic program will be organized around five units:

Systems Theory. Theories and models from the social and mathematical sciences which explain the human services system as single entities, sets of organizations in a field of service, and as sub-systems within a larger human services system.

Service System Studies. Education in the history, structure, and functioning of particular service systems such as health, income maintenance, and rehabilitation.

Leadership Function Studies. Education directed toward skill acquisition in management and administration, planning and design, research, policy analysis, and the organizational development.

Leadership Specialty Education. Further specialization in one or more leadership function studies.

Practicum. Application of knowledge to a research or work situation.

Flexible programming as a central concept will provide the ability to reach out to the program's target audience — employed personnel in human services disciplines in Maine. Seminars and courses may be offered at other University of Maine campuses, regional sites throughout the State, or at a person's place of employment. Alternative media may be used such as telelecture (an interactive telephone communication system) and self-programmed instructional packages.

Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
MASTERS DEGREE OPTION IN HUMAN SERVICES

The SIUE Human Services program operated for approximately three years between 1972 and 1975, at which time the coordinators withdrew the program because they felt "the organization should not continue to benefit from the program at the expense of the students and faculty who were carrying out the program with no assigned budget from any part of the organization."

During its operation, this program combined elements of preservice, inservice, and continuing education for personnel in virtually all human service systems and for multiple roles. Work experience and the curriculm were parts of an integrated whole, resulting in actual community change through activities initiated and implemented by student groups as part of their program.

A "process curriculum" spanned courses in a single, integrated process (in time, space, people, and content), and included cross-fields content covering such areas as Human Services Systems, Consultation, Crisis Intervention, Support Systems, Help-giving in Human Services, Community Mental Health, Organization Effectiveness, Interorganizational Processes, Citizen Action, the Nonprofessional, Program Development, Program/Evaluation, Community Organization and Development, Career Education, Legal Aspects of Human Services. Both inter and intra-course integration was represented in this curriculm.

Comparison of the Type III Programs

The only Type III programs that to our knowledge have existed in the country are the University of Maine (Portland-Gorham) and Southern Illinois University (Edwardsville) programs. The University of Maine's program is just beginning this academic year and SIUE's program, operating from 1972-1975, is no longer functioning. It is most interesting that these two programs have so many similarities, inasmuch as the University of Maine program/planners were unaware of SIUE's program and utilized a number of the same concepts and methods merely by coincidence.

Some of these similarities are listed below because they help to illustrate the nature of Type III programs:

1. Both programs serve a cross-systems, crossfields student constituency. Enrollees and graduates work or will work in a wide variety of human services fields and systems. They are not *field-centered* programs.

2. Both programs prepare students for multiple job roles, although the SIUE program included considerably more job roles than policy analysts and administrators prepared at the University of Maine. Both programs are not *role-centered* programs.

3. Both programs represent a Level I focus in terms of categorical specialization. That is, their focus is upon problems or needs addressed in their interrelationships among the special service areas; and the systems that serve as the basis for study and work include, in addition to the usual categorical systems, Health Systems Agencies, State Departments of Human Services, community multiservice centers, and other.

4. The content of the curriculum of both programs is specially designed for *non-centered* training; and this content is part of the core or specialization portion of the total program (i.e., it is not comprised of a series of courses that were already a part of other departmental offerings).

5. The cross-fields content of both programs is offered through more than three courses of the specialized core (i.e., this core is the primary specialization of study as opposed to a secondary specialization that complements other major specialization(s).

6. The curriculum of both programs is an integral part of the day-to-day and long-term activities of human services systems in the community and at State and Federal levels as well.

7. The program developers from both universities designed a special organizational structure out of which the graduate program was to operate, and in both cases this organizational mechanism was called a center. However, the structures and natures of the centers had many differences. In both cases, university processes and politics prevented the full implementation of the plans as proposed.

Some of the differences between the two programs are:

1. UM program development was funded through Title *XX monies;* SIUE program development had virtually no economic support.

2. The University of Maine program utilized committee and task force mechanisms more in the developmental stage.

3. SIUE program focus was spread more evenly across job roles in human services, whereas the UM program is more heavily oriented toward the role of administration.

4. UM's program development included more detailed and sophisticated needs assessment and financial planning.

5. Curriculum development in SIUE's program appears to cover a wider range of crossfields content.

Human Services Centers

To our knowledge there have been only five university human services centers in the country. Because of their integral relationship to education programs in human services at the graduate level, we have briefly described them here. Two of these organizational structures are not called *centers* but are included because of their close involvement with human services education programs.

Case Western Reserve University
HUMAN SERVICES DESIGN LABORATORY

This human services laboratory is a unit of the School of Applied Social Sciences. It is an interdisciplinary center engaged in developing new ways to apply social science and management science technologies to problems of policy formation, program design, coordination and evaluation of human service programs. Its function is to provide relevant and usable findings for application to the problems currently encountered by practitioners.

Inservice training, applied research, program evaluation, and the development of instruments and techniques for ongoing program feedback and decisionmaking are among the approaches used by HSDL is solution-oriented collaborative projects of current and emerging issues in service delivery systems.

As stated in its brochure, the objectives are:

- To provide technical assistance and applied research to human service organizations in problems relating to program design, service delivery, policy formation, management coordination, and program evaluation;
- To provide training in applied research and new service technologies for graduate students of the School of Applied Social Sciences; and,
- To provide opportunities for SASS faculty to conduct research and engage in technical assistance in their fields of expertise.

The Lab extends its assistance to various locations in Ohio and throughout the Middle West. Individual agencies, publically-funded and voluntary local programs, State offices, county boards, and associated organizations enlist the help of HSDL.

The program of HSDL has a variety of human service involvements. Some of the issues which comprise the scope of the Lab are: youth, housing, health, education, mental health, gerontology, prison reform, and the overall human service profession itself. Following are some of the particular activities in which the Lab has been working: design of county delivery systems for children's services; satellite expansion of community senior citizen programs; State and regional decisionmaking in correctional institutions; information systems used in health and welfare programming; individual agency programs of youth outreach, drug abuse projects, dropout programs, day care services, mental health programs, treatment clinics, alcoholism, delinquency prevention, and community needs-analysis; housing programs; senior citizen day care; evaluation of staff development programs; philanthropic surveys; needs surveys; program evaluations; and, public policy studies.

University of Maine, Portland-Gorham
HUMAN SERVICES DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

HSDI is one of four operating institutes comprising the Center for Research and Advanced Study on the Portland compus. It is involved with the practical problems facing the pro-

viders and consumers of Maine's public and private human services. Primarily, it conducts applied research for human service agencies, although it also delivers direct service through its training component.

HSDI presents decisionmakers with research findings, policy options and recommendations for more effective and efficient service delivery. It is also concerned with the interagency aspects of policies and the inter-relationships of human service systems. It concentrates its efforts in three functional areas: management systems, policy research, and education/training/advanced study.

To date it has worked with the health, mental health, social services, alcoholism and drug abuse, vocational rehabilitation, welfare and corrections systems. Clients have ranged from local planners to State departments and Federal agencies.

Work is conducted by a core of researchers qualified by education and experience. Interdisciplinary approaches to problem-solving are possible through collaboration with the center's economic and environmental institutes, as well as other university departments, private and out-of-state resources.

Project researchers possess expertise in a variety of service areas including health care systems, social service systems, rehabilitation, manpower systems, law, and educational technology and communications. In addition, they specialize in functional areas that cut across service systems and manpower development. Other professional staff provide technical capabilities in the areas of systems analysis, programming, statistical analysis, functional job analysis, and other job-related training.

San Jose State University
THE JOINT CENTER FOR HUMAN SERVICES DEVELOPMENT

The Center's mission is to contribute to the scope and purpose of the Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies, by facilitating the study and development of human services. Activities of the Center include reseach, planning, consultation, training and technical assistance, dissemination and evaluation.

Representative systems assisted by the Center are mental health, public welfare, education, health care, employment, housing and community development, recreation, rehabilitation, and family and child welfare.

Goals of the Center are:

1. To cause the concepts of human services to be understood and utilized by the deliverers of human services;
2. To utilize the full resources of the social and behavioral sciences in meeting the human services needs of people and their institutions;
3. To stay on the "leading edge" of the human services development field;
4. To cause an interdisciplinary participation in the Center among the relevant schools and departments of the university;
5. To cause the university curricula in the human services to remain current with relevant philosophies, trends, and needs of the day;
6. To cause a responsiveness among human services delivery systems to the rights and needs of consumers;

7. To share its learnings and experiences, in ways that are useful to "students" of human services development; and,
8. To endure as a self-sustaining and renewing resource.

Human Services Center
University of Southern California
College of Continuing Education

Although very limited in staff this Center has been able to carry out a wide range of activities by working with and through existing Federal, State and local governmental agencies, as well as with private human services organizations and agencies. Examples of activities of this Center in the past year include:

1. Planning and implementing two national conferences for human service social planners and educators.
2. Offering Continuing Education courses for human services professionals and paraprofessionals.
3. Providing ongoing consultive services to a range of community human service agencies.
4. Human Services publications.
5. Specific work in the Chinese and Hispanic communities of Los Angeles.
6. The continued development of a national human services professional network.

Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville
HUMAN SERVICES CENTER

This Center was established as an organizational mechanism to: a) provide for the development of university human services activities and education programs; and b) provide for the integration of these efforts with human services systems and activities in the community, as well as in State and Federal systems and activities. The Center is no longer operating due to the lack of economic and administrative support.

The Center was designed for use by students, staff, and faculty and their organizational units, and community human services personnel and their human services systems or organizations. While the Center *model* had multiple functions, the *negotiations* function may be of special interest to readers. For those who used the Center, the element of personal responsibility was symbolized by the requirement of "buying in" to the activity which they proposed, a formalized action that protected continuing multidirectional gain for all concerned.

Some of the multiple functions of the Center are described as follows (Chenault, 1975):

1. To facilitate the participation of individuals and groups who are otherwise locked into their system's organizational structures and hierarchies;
2. To record responsibility and accountability clearly and in advance, according to mutual agreements among colleagues;

3. To provide a public reward system built upon mutual agreements and freedom of choice;
4. To enable free access and exit in human services activities (within the responsibility/accountability agreements);
5. To encourage experimentation with new and original proposals for human services activities;
6. To nourish egalitarian relationships among colleagues;
7. To provide administrative superiors with continuing systematic information about what is going on within and outside their administrative boundaries;
8. To provide for all, equal access to information in a multidirectional flow;
9. To enable people at all levels to 'do business' with one another in mutually beneficial ways; and,
10. To reward individuals and groups for working collaboratively.

REFERENCES

Agranoff, R. "Human Services Administration: Service Delivery, Service Integration, and Training." *Human Services Integration.* Washington: Amer. Soc. For Pub. Adm., 1974, 42-51.

Audrey, R. *The Social Contract.* New York: Atheneum Publ., 1970.

Baker, F. "From Community Mental Health to Human Service Ideology." *American Journal of Public Health.* 1974, 64, 576-581.

Becker, H. and R. Smith. "The Curriculum of Mental Health/Human Services Training Programs at the Associate Degree Level." Survey Research Unit Report, Hopkins Population Center, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University. 1974.

Berg, I. *Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery.* New York: Praeger, 1970.

Beyle, T. and S. Gove. "The Problem of University Involvement and Commitment." In *The University and the Emerging Federalism.* S. Gove and E. Stewart (eds.) Urbana: University of Illinois Bulletin, 1972.

Bloom, B. (ed.) *Training Opportunities in Community Psychology and Mental Health: 1969-1970.* (Prepared by Committee on Manpower and Training, Division 27 of the American Psychological Assn.) Washington: APA.

Bloom, B. and H. Parad. "Interdisciplinary Training and Interdisciplinary Functioning: A Survey of Attitudes and Practices in Community Mental Health." *Amer. J. Orthopsychiat. 46,* 4, 1976, 669-677.

Briar, S. "The Future of Social Work: An Introduction." *Social Work. 19,* 1974, 514-518.

Broskowski, A. "Clinical Psychology: A Research and Development Model." *Professional Psychology* 1971, 2, 235-242.

REFERENCES

Broskowski, A. and M. Yessian. "Generalists in Human Service Systems: Their Problems and Prospects." *The Social Service Review* (In Press).

Brown, B. and J. Isbister. U.S. "Governemental Organization for Human Services-Implications for Mental Health Planning." In G. Caplan (ed.) Vol. 2, *American Handbook of Psychiatry*. New York: Basic Books, 1974, 571-578.

Burnford, F. and J. Chenault (eds.) *Human Services and Higher Education*. McGraw Hill, New York, N.Y. (In Press)

Butler, H. and J. Bilorusky. "Experimenting Community: A New Curriculm for Human Service Professions." *Education and Urban Society. 7*, 1975, 137-140.

Cheit, E. *The New Depression in Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Chenault, J. *Human Services Education and Practice: An Organic Model*. New York: Behavioral Publ., 1975.

Chenault, J. and F. Burnford. *Human Services Education: Current Trends and Future Directions*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.

Chenault, J. and W. Mermis. *The Professional Education of Human Services Personnel*. Commissioned Monograph. Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, U.S. Office of Education, 1976.

Cohen, A. "The Third Alternative." *Change*. (In Press)

Curtis, W. "Community Human Service Networks." *Psychiatric Annals*. 1973, 3, 23-42.

Demone, H. "Human Services at State and Local Levels and the Integration of Mental Health." In G. Caplan (ed.), Vol. 2. *American Handbook of Psychiatry*. New York: Basic Books, 1974, 579-592.

Demone, H. and D. Harshbarger. *A Handbook of Human Service Organizations*. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1974.

Denbow, S. and T. Nutt. "The Current State of Planning Education." *AIP Journal*. May, 1973, 203-209.

Dressel, P. et al. *The Confidence Crisis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Dressel, P. et al. "The Proliferating Institutes." *Change*. July/August, 1969.

Dumont, M. "The Changing Face of Professionalism." *Social Policy. 1,* 1970, 26-31.

Feldman, S. "Educating the Future Mental Health Executive: A Graduate Curriculum." *Adm. in Mental Health. 2,* 1974, 74-85.

Gartner, A. *The Preparation of Human Service Professionals.* New York: Human Sciences Press, 1976.

Gartner, A. and F. Riessman. *The Service Society and the Consumer Vanguard.* New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Golann, S. "Community Psychology and Mental Health: An Analysis of Strategies and a Survey of Training." In C. Spielberger and I. Iscoe (eds.) *Community Psychology: Perspectives in Training and Research.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Gross, R. and P. Osterman. *The New Professionals.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972.

Hansenfeld, Y. and R. English (eds.) *Human Service Organizations: A Book of Readings.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1974.

Hefferlin, J. *Dynamics of Academic Reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Heiss, A. *Challenges to Graduate Schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Ikenberry, S. and R. Friedman. *Beyond Academic Departments.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Jacobs, J. "A Survey of Graduate Education in Community Psychology." *American Psychologist.* 1972.

Kelly, J. "Qualities for the Community Psychologist." *American Psychologist. 26,* 1971, 897-903.

Knowles, J. *Views of Medical Education and Care.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Kuhn, A. *The Logic of Social Systems.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Lawrence, M. "Developing Program Models for the Human Services." In H. Schulberg and F. Baker (eds.), *Developments in Human Services.* Vol. 2 New York: Behavioral Publications, 1975.

REFERENCES

Levenson, A. "A Review of the Federal Community Mental Health Centers Program." In G. Caplan (ed.), Vol. 2. *American Handbook of Psychiatry*. New York: Basic Books, 1974, 593-604.

Lippit, G. "Training for a Changing World." *Training*. 12, 1975, 46-49.

McKenzie, R. "The Fragmented Search for the Whole in Human Services." In F. Burnford and J. Chenault (eds.) *Human Services and Higher Education*. McGraw-Hill, New York, N.Y. (In Press)

Mathew, L. and P. Ford. *Reform in Graduate Professional Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Mann, L. "Education Planning: A More Focussed Future." *The ASPO Magazine. 38*, 1972, 189-195.

Mermis, W. "Toward A Comprehensive Information System: An Integrated Human Services Literature." In F. Burnford and J. Chenault (eds.) *Human Services Education: Current Trends and Future Directions*. McGraw-Hill, New York, N.Y. (In Press).

Morales, C. and T. Mikulecky (eds.) *Human Services Integration*. Washington, D.C.: American Society for Public Administration, 1974.

Morris, R. "The Place of Social Work in the Human Services." *Social Work. 19*, 519-536.

Mosher, P. *Democracy and the Public Service*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

National Assn. of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration. "Guidelines and Standards for Professional Masters Degree Programs in Public Affairs and Public Administration." Washington: NASPAA, 1974.

Packer, H. and T. Ehrlich. *New Directions in Legal Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Panel on Alternate Approaches to Graduate Education. *Scholarship for Society*. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

Perkins, J. *The University as an Organization*. (A Report for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Pusey, N. and C. Taylor. *Ministry for Tomorrow*, New York: Seabury, 1967.

Reiff, R. "The Control of Knowledge: The Power of the Helping Professions." *J. Applied Beh. Sc. 10*, 1974, 451-461.

Rosenstein, A. *A Study of Professions and Professional Education.* Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969.

Schulberg, H. "Challenge of Human Services Programs for Psychologists." *Psychology.* 1972, 27, 566-573.

Schulberg, H. , F. Baker and S. Roen. "Human Services: The Challenge of the 1970's." In *Developments in Human Services.* Vol. 1 New York: Behavioral Publications, 1973.

Schein, E. *Professional Education: Some New Directions.* (A Report for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Slavin, R. and K. Olson. "Education for Public Administrators as Viewed from State Government." In *The University and the Emerging Federalism.* S. Gove and E. Stewart (eds.) Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Bulletin, 1972.

Snell, J. *The Education of Historians in the United States.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Spielberger, D. and I. Iscoe. *Community Psychology: Perspectives in Training and Research.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Sunderland, S. "Creating the New Profession: The Human Services." *Education and Urban Society. 7,* 1975, 141-171.

Underwood, K. *The Church, the University, and Social Policy.* Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1969.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Toward a Long-Range Plan for Federal Financial Support of Higher Education: A Report to the President.* Washington: Govt. Printing Office, 1969.

Vallance, T. "Processes, Problems, and Prospects for Innovating Within the University: Lessons from 45 Experiences." *J. of Higher Education.* 1971.

Weissman, H. "Overcoming Mismanagement in the Human Services Professions." San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Whaley, W. *Problems in Graduate Education.* Washington: Natl. Assn. of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1971.

APPENDICES

I SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

II RESPONDENTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE

III CONFERENCE ROSTER

I. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

HUMAN SERVICES PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE[4]

1. Program Title _____

2. Program Director _____ Phone ( ) _____

3. Institution _____
   Name

   _____
   Address

   _____
   City State Zip

GENERAL PROGRAM INFORMATION

4. Within what college, school, and/or department is your program's administrative/organizational home?

   _____

5. Please indicate the primary sources of economic support for your program by estimating the percent (%) of the total budget contributed by each source:

SOURCE	% OF TOTAL
University (including program tuition)	
Foundation	
Private funding other than foundation	
Federal	

[4]Continuing education, institute, and center directors who have multiple short-term projects and program will encounter some non-applicable items. Please attach special materials that describe your program.

6. Please check the appropriate range of your *assigned* budget* that is allocated for faculty salaries assigned specifically for your program.

Less than $20,000	$200,000 to $259,999
$20,000 to $79,999	$260,000 to $319,999
$80,000 to $139,999	$320,000 to $400,000
$140,000 to $199,999	Over $400,000

* funds specifically and officially earmarked for your program

7. The *assigned* annual budget, *not* including faculty salaries, for this program is:

____ Less than $500	____ $20,000 to $29,999
____ $500 to $1,499	____ $30,000 to $39,999
____ $1,500 to $2,999	____ $40,000 to $49,999
____ $3,000 to $4,999	____ $50,000 to $74,999
____ $5,000 to $9,999	____ $75,000 to $100,000
____ $10,000 to $19,999	____ Over $100,000

8. By what accrediting group(s), if any, is *your program* accredited?

_____

_____

9. At what stage of development is your program?

_____ Developmental stage
_____ Presently in the approval process
_____ Officially approved by appropriate university bodies _____ date

10. Please list the job titles and departments or organizations of those who were/are *primarily* responsible for the development of your program.

JOB TITLE	DEPARTMENT OR ORGANIZATION

11. Please check the primary purpose(s) of your program:

_____ Education/training
_____ Research
_____ Service
_____ Other (please specify) _____

_____

12. List the names of your institution's departments, schools, or units that:

a. Share formalized responsibility for the *administration* of your program:

_____

_____

_____

b. Offer *courses* in your program:

DEPARTMENT OR SCHOOL	% OF TOTAL COURSES

c. provide teaching faculty in the program:

DEPARTMENT OR SCHOOL	TOTAL NUMBER OF FACULTY	TOTAL FTE[5]

[5]Full time equivalents

13. List the names of the other institutions, organizations, or agencies that provide *faculty* for your program. (Include field placement sites *only* if supervisors hold faculty rank.)

_____ _____

_____ _____

14. What are the possible majors, specializations, or curricular options under your program?

_____ _____

_____ _____

15. Type of degree or credential awarded by this program:

_____ Certificate	_____ Post-doctoral degree or certificate
_____ Associate degree	_____ Other:
_____ Baccalaureate degree	_____
_____ Masters degree	
_____ Doctoral degree	

16. What is the total number of credits or time required for completion of this program?

_____ total semester hours
OR
_____ total quarter hours
OR
_____ total contact hours

17. For what career positions are students trained (e.g., probation officer, mental health administration, educator, social worker). If applicable, please indicate for what human service area.

POSITION	HUMAN SERVICE FIELD

18. The professional role (s) for which students are trained are primarily:

___ Direct service providers
___ Administrators
___ Other (please specify) _____

_____

19. Graduates of this program are trained primarily to: (check one)

( ) Perform a specialized job function or role within the *field* of _____ [job role] _____

( ) Perform a specialized job function or role *across* fields [job role]

_____

( ) Perform a number of job functions in the field of _____ [job functions] _____

_____

( ) Perform a number of job functions across the fields of [job functions]

_____

_____

20. What term best describes the graduates of your program? (check one)

_____ Generalist
_____ Specialist
_____ Other (please specify) _____

GOALS/OBJECTIVES/PHILOSOPHY

21. Please provide a brief *program description* including general program goals and purposes. (If already in printed form, please attach and identify)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

22. Please list specific program objectives.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

23. If there is a special philosophical or theoretical orientation for the program, please specify.

_____

_____

FACULTY/STAFF

24. Please specify:

a. The educational background of the program director:

_____ Bachelors degree
_____ Masters degree
_____ Doctorate
_____ Other (please specify) _____

b. The program director's major field of training:

_____

25. Please specify the educational background of this program's faculty and professional staff by indicating the full time equivalents at each level.

DEGREE	NUMBER OF FTE FACULTY/STAFF
Bachelors degree	
Masters degree	
Doctorate	
Other	

26. Please indicate the number (full-time equivalent) of your faculty/staff who have major educational training and/or expertise in each field below.

MAJOR FIELD	NUMBER OF FTE FACULTY/STAFF
Anthropology	
Business	
Education	
Fine Arts	
Humanities	
Law Enforcement	
Medicine	
Mental Health	
Nursing	
Philosophy	
Political Science	
Psychiatry	
Psychology	
Public Administration	
Public Health	
Science	
Social Work	
Sociology	
Other (specify)	

27. How many personnel are currently assigned to this program?

PERSONNEL	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME
Teaching faculty		
Administration		
Supervisory staff		
Clerical staff		
Other (please specify)		

28. Please estimate the percent (%) of *your program's* faculty who have had one or more years of *paid* work experience in community systems *other than* the university.

FIELD OF WORK	ESTIMATED % OF FACULTY (FTE)	
	1-3 yrs	More than 3 yrs
Health	%	%
Mental Health	%	%
Public Health	%	%
City/County/State/Federal Govt.	%	%
Social Work	%	%
Law Enforcement	%	%
Education (not university)	%	%
Other (specify)	%	%
	%	%

SPECIAL PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

29. Please list the major academic requirements for admission to this program.

_____

_____

_____

_____

CURRENT STATE OF HUMAN SERVICES PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

30. Please estimate current and anticipated student enrollment.

ENROLLMENT	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME
Current		
Anticipated for Fall '77		

31. Please estimate the number of students who graduated from this program

during the most recent operating year _____

during the first operating year _____

32. For Masters and Doctoral Students Only: Please estimate the percent (%) of students enrolled during the most recent operating year whose *previous* degrees were in the following subject areas.

DEGREE OF MAJOR FIELD	% of Students
Anthropology	
Business	
Education	
Fine Arts	
Humanities	
Law Enforcement	
Mental Health	
Nursing	
Philosophy	
Political Science	
Psychology	
Public Administration	
Public Health	
Science	
Social Work	
Sociology	
Urban Studies	
Other	

33. **Please estimate the percent (%) of students currently enrolled in this program who are also currently employed:**

_____ %

34. **Please list a representative sampling of the fields of employment of current students:**

35. **Please estimate the percent of *graduates* who are currently *un*employed.**

_____ % of graduates

36. **Please provide information regarding age, sex, and ethnic background for current students (full-time and part-time combined).**

a.

AGE	ESTIMATED % OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT
17-21	%
22-30	%
31-40	%
Over 40	%

b. **Please estimate the percent of your total enrollment of students who are *female*.**

_____ % of enrollment

c.

ETHNIC BACKGROUND	ESTIMATED % OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT
Caucasian/White	
Black/Afro-American	
Chicano/Mexican-American	
Other Spanish-speaking American	
American Indian/Native American	
Oriental/Asian-American	
(specify other)	

CURRICULUM

37. Please list the required courses for this program. Indicate those courses that are required to be taken early (E), middle (M), or Late (L) in the program, and name the university department or academic unit offering the course. (Please place a check mark in front of those courses that were developed as new, not revised, courses specifically for this program.)

COURSE TITLE	WHEN REQUIRED	SPONSORING UNIT

38. Please attach official university course descriptions for *required* courses.

39. List titles of new courses presently *being developed.*

COURSE TITLE	SPONSORING UNIT

40. Please list course titles of program *electives* or representative electives:

COURSE TITLE	SPONSORING UNIT

FIELD EXPERIENCE

41. Check at what point (s) in the program the field experience occurs.

___ Beginning or early in the program
___ Midway in the program
___ End or near the end of the program
___ After completion of academic program
___ Other (please specify) _____

42. Please indicate the average number of work hours per week required while students are enrolled in field experience.

_____ hours per week

43. List five (5) representative agencies where your students acquire field experience. (If the name is not self-explanatory, please provide the category of human service of which it is a member.)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

44. Please indicate the percent of program credits required by:

academic courses ___ % field experience ___ %

45. Check the principal methods (s) of evaluation for field experience.

_____ Written exam
_____ Oral exam
_____ Written report or paper
_____ Faculty observation or supervision
_____ Agency observation or supervision
_____ Other (please specify)

46. Please list any expected student outcomes or competency goals for this program.

_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____ _____

CURRICULAR PATTERNS

47. Indicate for the total program the general spread of content across professional fields (e.g., psychology, social work, education, public health)

FIELD OF CONTENT	% OF TOTAL COURSES

48. Please check which curricular pattern best describes the *required* courses of your program:

a. ___ A combination of courses representing a *single* specialized "field" (e.g., courses representing various aspects of social work *or* public administration *or* education);

b. ___ Three or more basic requirements representing different academic disciplines plus three or more elected field specializations;

c. ___ A combination of a) and b) above, with some required cognates and some required field specialization;

d. ___ A required core of courses that cut across three or more fields;

e. ___ Other _____

_____

49. Described below are various content categories for *individual courses*. Please indicate the percent of your courses falling in any of the following content categories:

% OF TOTAL COURSES	INTRA-COURSE CONTENT CATEGORIES
_____	Specialized technology (course titles such as Information Systems Design, Communication Skills, Statistics, Criminology)
_____	Specialized content of a *particular field* (course titles such as Epidemiology, Group Therapy, Seminar in Bureaucracy)
_____	General basic content of a particular field (course titles such as Introduction to . . . , Principles of . . . [Social Work, Counseling, etc.]
_____	Generalist (courses containing *equally balanced* representation of 3 or more field specializations; e.g., Human Service Systems, Program Evaluation)

50. Please check with method(s), if any, are used to integrate the subject matter between and among courses:

___ Professional seminars
___ Field experience
___ Team teaching
___ Other (please specify) _____

EVALUATION

51. In the current state of your program development, please indicate the overall level of program evaluation:

_____ No evaluation system at the present time other than course grades and completion of program;
_____ Program is evaluated on the same basis as other degree programs on campus;
_____ Program has had external evaluation;
_____ Program evaluation now underway; results will be available _____;
_____ Evaluation criteria are linked to program objectives;
_____ Evaluation includes both process and outcome criteria;
_____ Evaluation includes assessment of responses of (check all that apply):
___ students ___ faculty ___ administrators
___ community organizations, including prospective employers
_____ Evaluation uses a method of follow-up on program graduates to determine satisfaction and employment outcomes;
_____ Students participate in developing program evaluation criteria.

PROBLEMS AND NEEDS

52. The items below have been suggested by program developers as serious barriers to the development or success of programs. Please check those items that have represented barriers for you, and rank the five (5) most serious problems by placing next to the selected items *1* for the most serious, *2* for the second most serious, etc.

_____ Recruitment of students
_____ Inadequate preparation of entering students
_____ Acceptance of graduates into advanced education or graduate schools
_____ Lack of faculty interest outside your own department or unit
_____ General faculty resistence
_____ Faculty concern about academic standards
_____ Administrators' concerns about academic standards
_____ Administrators' lack of knowledge about the subject area of program
_____ General suspicion of passing fad
_____ Lack of economic support
_____ Lack of administrative leadership above program level
_____ Competition with other university programs for community field placement
_____ Supervision of field assignments
_____ Problems of faculty recruitement for reasons other than economic
_____ Problems associated with assessment of field or experiential learning
_____ Program accreditation, licensing, or certification
_____ Student job placement after graduation
_____ Other (please specify) _____

_____

53. Please indicate any anticipated changes or future developments in your program.

_____

_____

_____

54. Please list what you consider to be the three (3) most innovative or nontraditional features of your program:

_____

_____

_____

55. What three (3) things are most needed to make your program a success?

_____

_____

_____

THE CONCEPT OF HUMAN SERVICES

56. Do you believe there should be a special field or discipline called human services?

_____ Yes ___ No ___ Undecided

57. What do you consider to be the major issues that need to be examined by educators of human services personnel?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

58. Please send additional materials such as *brochures, syllabi, and other descriptive materials* regarding your program.

YOUR COOPERATION IN COMPLETEING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS GREATLY APPRECIATED. WE ARE CONFIDENT THAT THE RESULTS OF THIS EFFORT WILL BE OF INTEREST AND OF USE TO YOU. THANK YOU!

II. QUESTIONAIRE RESPONDENTS

University of Alabama in Birmingham
Health Services Administrators Development Program
School of Public and Allied Health
Richard Thompson

American College of Hospital Administration
Division of Education
James Martin

Antioch College/Appalachia
Social Science Program/Human Services Major
Robert Snyder

Antioch College/Washington
Human Services Delivery and Administration
Al Engleman

University of Arizona
Arizona Cooperative Extension Service
College of Agriculture
Gerald Stairs

University of Arizona
College of Nursing
Gladys Sorenson

Bangor Community College of the University of Maine
Human Service Program (Associate Degree)
Department of Health/Human Services
Mary Lou Cormier

Boston College
Community Organization/Social Planning
School of Social Work
Fideliz Masi

Boston University
Health Care Management
School of Management
Hopkins Holmberg

Brigham Young University
Social Work
Sociology Department
Eugene Gibbons

University of California-Davis
Community Development Program
Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences
Ed Blakely

University of California-Irvine
Community Mental Health
Psychiatry and Human Behavior
E. M. Pattison

California School of Professional Psychology-Fresno
Abou-Ghorra

Information is listed in the following order: Name of institution, Title of program responding, Organizational unit within which the program resides, and Name of respondent.

California State University-Fresno
Child Development Major
School of Professional Studies, Home Economics Department
Gwen Cocke

California State University-Hayward
Social Services Option
Department of Sociology
Richard Larson

California State University-San Francisco
Department of Social Work Education
School of Behavioral and Social Sciences
Phyllis Rochelle

Case Western Reserve University
Human Services Design Laboratory
School of Applied Social Science
Thomas Holland

Claremont Graduate School
Public Policy Studies Program
Forest Harrison

University of Cincinnati
Child Care Technology
Psychology/Sociology

University of Cincinnati
Community Health Planning/Administration
College of Community Services
Marvin Strauss

University of Cincinnati
Community Planning Program
Department of Community Planning
Kenneth Corey

University of Cincinnati
Community Psychology Institute
Department of Psychology
Brendan Reddy

University of Cincinnati
Criminal Justice Program
College of Community Services
Robert Mills

University of Cincinnati
Law Enforcement Technology

University of Cincinnati
Rehabilitation Counselor Training Program
College of Community Services
Julian Myers

University of Cincinnati
Social Science Technology

University of Cincinnati
Social Welfare/Social Work Program
College of Community Services
Stephney Keyser

University of Cincinnati
Urban Affairs
College of Community Services
Sam Sherrill

College of Human Services
201 Varick St.
New York, New York
Audrey Cohen

University of Colorado
Clinical Psychology Graduate Training Program
Department of Psychology
Don Weatherley

University of Colorado
Guidance and Counseling
School of Education
Albert Roark

Colorado State University
Center for Continuing Education
John Snider

Cornell University
Department of Community Services Education/Human Services Studies
College of Human Ecology
Irving Lazar

Duke University
Department of Health Administration
Jon Jaegar

Florida State University
School of Social Work
College of Social Science and Law
Diane Bernard

George Washington University
Institute for Educational Leadership
Sam Halperin

University of Georgia
Special Studies Division
Leroy Ervin

University of Hartford
Organizational Behavior/Management Department
School of Business and Public Administration

University of Hartford
Psychology, Clinical Practices
Psychology Department
Julian Streirfelc

University of Hawaii at Manoa
School of Public Health
College of Health Sciences and Social Welfare
Jerrold Michael

University of Hawaii at Manoa
School of Social Work
College of Health Sciences and Social Welfare
Daniel Sanders

University of Houston
Masters Program in Administration
College of Business Administration
Wendy Miner

University of Houston
Family Services
College of Social Science
Shirley Egell/Terry Rooney

University of Houston
Graduate School of Social Work
Gary Lloyd

University of Houston
Institute for Urban Studies
College of Social Science
Louis Stern

Howard University
School of Human Ecology
Cecile Edwards

Idaho State University
Masters Program in Psychology
Cole Brown

Indiana State University
Recreation, Environmental Health, Sanitary Science, Environmental Safety Management, Community Health Education
School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Howard Richardson

University of Kentucky
Master of Public Administration Program

University of Kentucky
College of Social Professions
Ronda Connaway

Louisiana State University
School of Social Welfare
Bernard Wiese

University of Maine-Portland
Criminal Justice
Arts and Sciences College
Peter Lehman

University of Maine-Portland-Gorham
Human Services Development Institute
Stephen Simonds

The Menninger Foundation
Department of Education
Philip Woolcott, Jr.

University of Miami
Human Services/Community Counseling
School of Education
Joseph Barton

University of Michigan
Program and Bureau of Hospital Administration
John Griffith

University of Michigan
Institute of Public Policy Studies
Jack Walker

University of Michigan
Institute for Study of Mental Retardation and Related Disabilities
William Cruickshank

University of Michigan
Urban and Regional Planning Program
School of Graduate Studies
John Nystuen

University of Michigan, Wayne State
Institute of Gerontology
Harold Johnson

University of Minnesota
Human Services Generalist Program (AA or BA)
General College
David Foat

University of Minnesota
Mental Health Administration
School of Public Health
John Malban

University of New Mexico
Community Services Worker Program
School of Medicine
Stephen Perls

University of North Carolina
Human Services Administration Program
Sagar Jain

University of North Carolina
Mental Health Administration Program
School of Medicine
William Hollister

North Texas State University
Center for Studies in Aging
School of Community Services
Cora Martin/H. J. Friedsam

Oakland University
Human Resources Program
School of Education
William Moorhouse

Ohio State University
College of Social Work
Robert Washington

Ohio University
Mental Health Technology
Social Work Department
Miriam Clubok

Ohio University
Social Work
Arts and Sciences
Helen Worstell

University of Oklahoma
Continuing Education and Public Service
Gregory Shinert

University of Oklahoma
Human Relations Program
Arts and Sciences
George Henderson

University of Oklahoma
School of Social Work
F. J. Peirce

University of Oklahoma
Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies
Division of Continuing Education and Public Service
Gregory Shinert

Orange County Department of Mental Health
Orange County, California

University of Oregon
Counseling Center
Division of Student Personnel Services
Saul Toobert

University of Ottawa
School of Health Administration
D. LeTouze

George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee

Pennsylvania State University
Individual and Family Studies
College of Human Development
Paul Baltes

University of Pittsburgh
Graduate School of Public Health

Purdue University
Center for Public Policy and Public Administration
Graduate School
David Caputo

Purdue University
Child Development and Early Childhood Program
Department of Child Development and Family Studies
Florence Kerckhoff

Purdue University
Dietetics
School of Consumer and Family Sciences
P. Abernathy and J. Cioch

Purdue University
Psychological Services Center
Student Services, Department of Psychology
Jim Linden

Purdue University
Social Welfare-Community Service
Department of Consumer Sciences and Retailing
Coradel Hamilton

University of Rhode Island
Adult Education and Resource Development Education
College of Resource Development
D. E. McCreight

University of Rhode Island
College of Home Economics
Elizabeth Crandall

St. Louis University
Hospital and Health Care Administration
James Brigham, Jr.

San Francisco State University
Applied Gerontology Certification Program
Barbara Wertheimer

Sangamon State University (Illinois)
Human Development Counseling
Professional Studies
Robert Crowley

San Jose State University
Joint Center for Human Services Development
School of Social Work and Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies
Jim Kouzes

San Jose State University
Department of Nursing
School of Applied Sciences and Arts
Gloria Vanicko

San Jose State University
Department of Occupational Therapy
Arts and Sciences
Joyce Ward

Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
Master of Public Administration
Department of Political Science
Charles Goodsell

Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville
Delinquency Study and Youth Development Center
Robert Gilland

Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville
Human Services Option (Masters)
School of Education
William Mermis/Joann Chenault

University of South Carolina
College of Criminal Justice
William Mathias

University of South Carolina
Rehabilitation Services Training Program
College of Education
Leon Lessinger

University of South Carolina
School of Public Health
College of Public Health/Associated Health Programs
Rolf Lynton

South Dakota State University
Psychology Technician Program
Psychology Department
Richard Ritter

University of South Dakota
Social Work Program
Department of Social Behavior
Louise Johnson

University of South Florida
Guidance Program
College of Education
Ed Panther

University of South Florida
Reading Education
College of Education
A. J. Lowe

University of Southern California
Office of Program Development
School of Public Administration
Michael Hansen

State University College at Brockport (New York)
Faculty of Human Services
Darwin Palmiere

State University of New York at Buffalo
Human Resources Institute
School of Management
Tom Gutteridge

University of Tennessee
Division of Human Services (BA)
College of Professional Studies
James Sikora

University of Tennessee
School of Social Work (MSW)
Ben Granger

University of Tennessee at Martin
Social Work Program (BS)
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Betty Rasberry

Temple University
Developmental Disabilities Center/University Affiliates Program
Human Services Planning Department
Edward Newman

Temple University
Human Services Administration Group
(development group)
Richard Schultz

Trinity University (Texas)
Business and Management
Department of Health Care Administration
Stephen Tucker

University of Tulsa
Clinical-Applied Psychology
Department of Psychology
Cullen Mancuso

University of Tulsa
Division of Continuing Education
Milt Jarrett

CURRENT STATE OF HUMAN SERVICES PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

University of Tulsa
College of Nursing
Neila Poshek

University of Tulsa
Preprofessional Social Work
Department of Sociology
Barry Kinsey

University of Tulsa
Division of Professional Teacher Education
College of Education
Shirley Robards

University of Tulsa
Urban Studies
Arts and Sciences
Earl Reeves

Vanderbilt University
Clinical Psychology
Arts and Sciences
Richard Blanton

Vanderbilt University
Psychiatric-Mental Health Nursing
School of Nursing
Dorothy Kent

University of Washington
Center for Health Services Research
Department of Health Services
Stephen Shortell

University of Washington
Graduate School of Public Affairs (MPA)
Brewster Denny

Washington University
School of Social Work
Shanti Khinduka

Washington University (St. Louis)
School of Medicine
Graduate Program in Health Care Administration
James Hepner

University of Washington
Society and Justice Program
Arts and Sciences
Ezra Stotland

Western Michigan University
Blind Rehabilitation and Mobility Program
College of Health and Human Services
D. Blasch

Western Michigan University
Occupational Therapy Program
B. Rider

Western Michigan University
School of Social Work
College of Health and Human Services
Robert Barstow

Western Michigan University
Specialty Program in Alcohol and Drug Abuse
College of Health and Human Services
Thomas Williams

Western Michigan University
Speech Pathology and Audiology
Frank Robinson

West Texas State University
Criminal Justice (BA)
Arts and Sciences
Brent Lynch

West Texas State University
Social Work (BA)
Arts and Sciences
Ross Staton

West Texas State University
School of Nursing
Hazel Aslakson

West Virginia University
Coordinated Undergraduate Dietetic Program
College of Human Resources and Education
Jane Goodman

West Virginia University
Counseling, Guidance, and Rehabilitation Counseling
College of Human Resources and Education
Jeffrey Messing

West Virginia University
Public Administration Program
Arts and Sciences
Herman Mertins

West Virginia University
Speech Pathology and Audiology
Department of Arts and Sciences
Norman Lass

West Virginia University
System and Community Psychology Program
Department of Psychology
Dwight Harshbarger

University of Wisconsin
Health Services Administration
Business and Medical Schools
Rockwell Schutz

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
School of Social Welfare
George O'Brien (Stuart Kirk)

Xavier University
Graduate Program in Hospital and Health Administration
Edward Arlinghaus

III. HUMAN SERVICES/HIGHER EDUCATION

BUSINESS AS USUAL OR NEW DIRECTIONS?

ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS

Robert Agranoff, Ph.D
Acting Director
Center for Governmental Studies
Northern Illinois University
146 Carrol Ave.
DeKalb, IL 60115

Frank Baker, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychiatry
Director, Division of Community Psychiatry
School of Medicine
State University of New York at Buffalo
Department of Psychiatry
462 Grider St.
Buffalo, NY 14215

Antonia Bercovici, Ph.D.
Director of Human Services Programs
California State College, Dominguez Hills
Dominguez Hills, CA 90747

Edward Blakely, Ph.D.
Associate Dean
Applied Economics and Behavioral Sciences
College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences
228 Mrak Hall
University of California, Davis
Davis, CA 95616

Annette Bremner
Administrative Assistant
Human Services Center
College of Continuing Education
University of Southern California
University Park
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Greg Buntz, Ph.D.
Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Legislation
Health Resources Administration
5600 Fishers Lane
Room 10-A-40
Rockville, MD 20857
(Assistant Professor
Public Administration
University of Arizona
On leave 1976-1977)

Allan Burdick
Director, Technical Services
County Supervisors Association of California
11th and L Building, Suite 201
Sacramento, CA 95814

Edmund Burke, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Graduate School of Social Work
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02167

Fran Burnford
Director, Human Services Center
College of Continuing Education
University of Southern California
University Park
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Victor Capoccia, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Community Organization/Social Planning
Boston College Graduate School of Social Work
Chestnut Hill, MA 02167

Brooks Carder, Ph.D.
Synanon Research Institute
P.O. Box 786
Marshall, CA 94940

Beau Carter
California State Liaison Officer
Office of Intergovernmental Affairs
DHEW/Region IX
Room 441
50 United Nations Plaza
San Francisco, CA 94102

Joann Chenault, Ph.D.
Professor of Education
Box 123
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
Edwardsville, IL 62052

Audrey Cohen, President
College for Human Services
201 Varick St.
New York, NY 10014

Fred Davis, Director, Human Services Institute
California State University, Sacramento
Sacramento, CA 95819

Hubert Davis
Assistant to the Associate Administrator for Planning, Research, and Evaluation
SRS/DHEW
Mary Switzer Building
330 C. St., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Saul Feldman, D.P.A.
Director, Staff College
National Institute of Mental Health
2340 University Blvd. East
Adelphi, MD 20783

George Frederickson, Ph.D.
President
Eastern Washington State College
Cheney, WA 99004

Dan Fritz, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Gerontology (Public Administration)
Leonard Davis School of Gerontology
University of Southern California
University Park
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Colleen Haffner
Assistant Director of Resident Life
012 La Plata Hall
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Dona Hoard,
Associate
Marshall Kaplan, Gans, Kahn
Suite 300
222 Columbus Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94133

Thomas Holland, Ph.D.
Director, Human Services Design Laboratory
School of Applied Social Services
Yost Hall
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

Jeffalyn Johnson, Ph.D.
Consultant
2301 Jefferson Davis Hwy.
#519
Arlington, VA 22202

Charles Keeran, Associate Director of Administration
UCLA Center for Health Sciences
760 Westwood Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Randall King
Director of the Department of Human Resources
City of Simi Valley
3200 Cochran St.
Simi Valley, CA 93065

CURRENT STATE OF HUMAN SERVICES PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Michael Kolitsky, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
California Lutheran College
60 West Olsen Rd.
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360

Charles McClintock, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Community Service Foundation
College of Human Ecology
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853

Bob McKenzie, Ph.D.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
6440 Gerard Court
Falls Church, VA 22043

William Mermis, Ph.D.
Professor of Education
Box 123
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
Edwardsville, IL 62025

Paul Nash, Ph.D.
Chairman, Department of Humanistic and Behavioral Studies
School of Education
Boston University
232 Bay State Rd.
Boston, MA 02215

Gene Orro, Ph.D.
Director, Mental Health and Human Systems Design and Administration,
Doctoral Program, School of Education,
Graduate Research Center
368 Hills South
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01002

Darwin Palmiere, Ph.D.
Professor of Human Services
State University College
Brockport, NY 14420

Carol Parry
Assistant Commissioner
NYC Special Services for Children
80 Lafayette St.
New York, NY 10013
(Representing the National Association of Social Workers)

Barbara Perrow, Ph.D.
Executive Director for Degree Related Programs
College of Continuing Education
University of Southern California
University Park
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Barbara Pomeroy
Deputy Regional Commissioner
SRS/DHEW
3535 Market
P.O. Box 7760
Philadelphia, PA 19101

Beryl Radin, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
LBJ School of Public Affairs
University of Texas
Austin, TX 78712

John Schiller, Ph.D.
Professor of Sociology
Pacific Lutheran University
Tacoma, WA 98447

Ed Schoenberger
Special Consultant for Human Resources
California League of Cities
Hotel Claremont
Berkeley, CA 94705

Dan Sprague
Deputy Regional Director
DHEW/Region IX
50 United Nations Plaza
San Francisco, CA 94102

Warrington Stokes
Chief, Social Program Planning and Development
Human Resources Agency, Contra Costa County
651 Pine St.
Martinez, CA 94553

Bruce Storm, Ph.D.
Associate Dean
School of Public Administration
University of Southern California
University Park
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Stephen Tucker, D.B.A.
Associate Director
Department of Health Care Administration
Trinity University
715 Stadium Dr.
San Antonio, TX 78284

Joseph J. Walka, Ph.D.
Associate Dean
College of Business and Public Administration
University of Arizona
Tucson, AR 85721

William Webster
Deputy Superintendent for Programs
State Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

Myron Weiner, Ph.D.
Extension Professor
Institute of Public Services
Box U-14
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Conn. 06268

Barbara Wertheimer
Coordinator, Applied Gerontology Program
San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94132

Mark Yessian, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Graduate School of Administration
Suffolk University
160 Commonwealth Ave.
Boston, MA 02116

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1978-260-923/5024